

PROGRAMMING HOMELAND SECURITY: CITIZEN PREPAREDNESS
AND THE THREAT OF TERRORISM

David Register, B.F.A.

Thesis Prepared for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

August 2007

APPROVED:

Brian Lain, Major Professor
John M. Allison, Committee Member and Chair of
the Department of Communication Studies
Kelly Taylor, Committee Member
Sandra L. Terrell, Dean of the Robert B. Toulouse
School of Graduate Studies

Register, David, Programming homeland security: Citizen preparedness and the threat of terrorism. Master of Science (Communication Studies), August 2007, 88 pp., references, 131 titles.

This thesis tests the necessity of terrorism in articulating Homeland Security citizenship. Chapter 1 orients the study, reviewing relevant literature. Chapter 2 examines the USDHS *Ready Kids* program's Homeland Security Guide, mapping a baseline for how Homeland Security citizenship is articulated with the overt use of terrorism. Chapter 3 investigates the USDHS *Ready Kids* program, charting the logic of Homeland Security citizenship when the threat of terrorism is removed from sense making about preparedness. Chapter 4 compares the findings of Chapters 2 and 3, evaluating the similarities and differences between these two articulations of Homeland Security citizenship and concluding that the logic that cements Homeland Security into American society does not depend on the threat of terrorism against the United States.

Copyright 2007

by

David Register

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction to the Study	
Statement of the Problem	
Scope of the Study	
Review of Literature	
Approach to Criticism	
Preview of Chapters	
2. TERRORISM AND THE HOMELAND SECURITY GUIDE.....	25
Introduction	
National Unity	
Consumerism and Citizenship	
Social Networking	
Conclusion	
3. READY KIDS AND THE WEATHER.....	45
Introduction	
Cartoons and Education	
The Weather Swap	
Dangerous Weather	
Mountain Lions and the Natural World	
Citizen-Rulers	
Animals and Property	
4. CONCLUSION.....	63
Commonalities	
Differences and Conclusions	
Shortcomings and Opportunities for Future Research	
Conclusion	
NOTES.....	74
REFERENCES.....	76

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction to the Study

In the years following the attacks of September 11, 2001, the Executive Branch of the United States government transformed rapidly, centralizing its agencies and circumventing judicial checks on its authority to investigate and detain. Under the rubric of Homeland Security, the Bush administration appropriated a number of diverse Executive agencies into a singular security entity and dubbed the new chimera, The United States Department of Homeland Security (USDHS, 2003a). This centralization continues to increase (Bay, 2005; Deflem, 2004), and when coupled with the continuous renewal of the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorists Act (USA PATRIOT Act) marks a normative shift regarding the value of individual rights in the United States. What Donald Pease (2003) described as the “Homeland Security State” nullifies significantly the strength of First and Fourth Amendment protections for U.S. citizens (Barr, 2003; Eland, 2003; Hentoff, 2003; Parenti, 2002; “Patriot Act,” 2006). These developments allow the Executive Branch to initiate an array of surveillance techniques without a court order, and, notably, the new laws contain virtually zero protections for citizens (Copeland, 2004; Eland, 2003; Parenti, 2002). The government now possesses license to investigate secretly any individual in the United States, even if no ties between a particular individual and terrorism exist. At the time of this writing the Bush administration admits openly to employing these techniques of surveillance and stands by their legality (Lichtblau, 2006). The negative rights providing protection against illegal search and seizure as well as infringements on free expression now offer little to no defense against a state defined by the terms of Homeland Security and the War on Terror. Anyone who watches television or reads newspapers understands that the War on Terror asks Americans to sacrifice

certain liberties in the name of Homeland Security, and that dissenters often find themselves characterized as enemies of the state. In fact, the vague provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act allow the targeting of dissenters for surveillance simply because of their opposition to national security policies (Parenti, 2002). College and university faculty who have spoken out against U.S. foreign policy since September 11 have been disciplined, reprimanded, and even denied tenure (Bird & Brandt, 2002; Butler, 2002; McCulloch, 2002). Prominent leaders in the academy, such as university presidents and provosts, often distance themselves from campus critics, leaving dissenters virtually unprotected when face-to-face with the agents of Homeland Security (Bird & Brandt, 2002). This situation continues to worsen. New programs in development both put the CIA on campus in a number of capacities, and also seek to establish advisory boards to monitor scholarship concerning international relations and foreign language studies (Rajiva, 2006).

As Der Derian (2002) noted, the War on Terror is a war of networks, in which a “military-industrial-media-entertainment network” tracks an elusive, quasi-invisible, and networked enemy. This hunt revolves around the paradox of attempting to stamp out an enemy that resists eradication by multiplying, dividing, and reorganizing itself constantly. In response to this lurking threat, the United States federal government has turned inward, initiating a downward spiral of limiting civil liberties in the hope of rooting out potential threats. American society now exists in a permanent *state of exception*, where security eats away at democracy as individual rights become subject to revocation at any time (Agamben, 2002). The distinction between citizen and terrorist has become blurred and mobile, producing the potential for anyone to be a terrorist. Punctuating the stakes in this new formation of threats and security, a risk exists that, “it may lead to security and terrorism forming a single deadly system in which they

mutually justify and legitimate each others' actions" culminating in "a worldwide civil war which destroys all civil coexistence" (Agamben, ¶ 4-5).

Statement of the Problem

How this situation developed and its impact constitute a problem worthy of scholarly investigation, since the revaluation of security over individual rights locates scholarship within the same complex of surveillance and control as society writ-large. Moreover, this problem is grounded in human communication because information is the life-blood of the new network(s) of security, and speed of processing is the most important factor in preventing new threats before they materialize (Der Derian, 2002, ¶ 21). These threats all center around the protection of citizens from an ambiguous terrorist figure, but criticism, or the analysis of social artifacts, faces a low ceiling when 9/11 is understood as the origin of Homeland Security. This limit is two-fold. First, the years since the attack are divorced from the rest of American history as they are considered a response to the exigence of international terrorism. What is left out is the history of U.S. foreign policy that helped to produce terrorist networks, as well as previous wartime security measures inside the United States. Second, centering the security/terrorism relationship in criticism of Homeland Security attenuates explanation to a simple causality. In other words, terrorism becomes the locus of all explanations of Homeland Security, and a simple cause and effect relationship between terrorism and security guides critical approaches to recent developments in national security.

In this reading of Homeland Security, the counterpart to fear of terrorism is pride in citizenship. Homeland Security strategies to control the images of the War of Terror attempt overtly to foster nationalistic and patriotic images, connecting citizenship to ritual sacrifice (Der Derian, 2002; Marvin, 2005). This pattern of image control is nothing new to the United States;

however, the centralization of control over the media, industry, military, and entertainment characteristic of Homeland Security is unprecedented (Der Derian, 2002). A society defined by radical individualism seems an unlikely candidate for authoritarian controls, so the distinction between proud citizen and hate-mongering terrorist becomes a central element in the proliferation of networks of security. In other words, Americans sacrifice their freedoms willingly in order to stop a constant threat to their way of life. The problem; however, with understanding Homeland Security along the citizen/terrorist binary lies in the narrow assumptions about how individuals interact with the world around them. Foucault (1988b) emphasized that humans are thinking beings, meaning:

that even when we kill or when we are killed,...even when we vote for or against a government which cuts social security expenses and increases defense spending,...we do these things not only on the ground of universal rules of behavior but also on the specific ground of a historical rationality (p. 148).

To attribute all individual sense making about Homeland Security to a kind of rally-around-the-flag pride and fear of attack limits the ability of criticism by assuming that Americans think only in these terms. The average American citizen probably does not consider in her/his everyday activities that s/he will be sent to Guantanamo Bay, nor that s/he will be robbed of all the protections of citizenship. Professionals in the academy are not committing physical acts of terrorism when investigating Homeland Security. Nevertheless, the legal vagueness of Homeland Security implicates all citizens as possible suspects in the War on Terror. What emerges in these observations is an indication that citizens face the material effects of Homeland Security even if they have neither an affiliation with a terrorist organization nor have ever participated in terrorist activities. In other words, an understanding of Homeland Security

predicated on the citizen/terrorist binary falters when the terrorist is no longer entirely necessary to animate network(s) of security. This situation raises the question, might societal normalization to Homeland Security revolve around categories of identity/difference rather than that of citizen/terrorist?

Scope of the Study

This study investigates the necessity of the connection between terrorism and the growth of Homeland Security. Specifically, this work examines how Homeland Security citizenship is constructed absent an ominous threat of terrorist attack. In other words, this study seeks to address how sense making about Homeland Security changes when terrorism is removed, and if these changes might produce the same type of docile subjects as a logic of Homeland Security grounded in the inevitability of terrorism. To address this question, this thesis focuses on how rhetoric articulates Homeland Security citizenship. This central concern fosters a type of criticism that explores the enactment of citizenship, not just its status as an ideal. Robert Asen (2004) outlined the benefits to this approach, contending that:

Reorienting our framework from a question of *what* to a question of *how* usefully redirects our attention from acts to action. Inquiring into the *how* of citizenship recognizes citizenship as a process. From this perspective, citizenship does not appear in specific acts per se, but signals a process that may encompass a number of different activities (p. 191).

The value of this line of investigation regarding citizenship rests in its assumption that people enact citizenship in different ways. For the purpose of this study, this approach offers a vocabulary of citizenship that can illustrate the multi-modal articulations of citizenship as enactments of daily activities. In the case of Homeland Security, the primary activity for citizens is the practice(s) of individual preparedness. Because of the suddenness of disaster,

preparedness must be a constant process of readying for emergent dangers through the practices carried out in everyday life. What constitutes the dangers against which one prepares becomes the most relevant point of inquiry for this work, since Homeland Security is underwritten by the War on Terror. In fact, most criticism on the relationship of citizenship to Homeland Security tends to rely on a figure of terrorism to define the enactment of citizenship and the exercise of rights. Fear of the terrorist activates decisionmaking about citizenship along all other categories of identity/difference pulled into the logic of Homeland Security. This thesis tests the assumption that the citizen/terrorist binary is necessary to Homeland Security by investigating the selective use of terrorism as an instrument for sense making about citizen preparedness. At stake in this endeavor is the possibility of comprehending the logic that cements Homeland Security into American society. In addition, the conclusions drawn by scholars about the avenues for effective resistance to Homeland Security may face difficulties if their reliance on fear of terrorism and nationalistic pride to understand normalization turns out to be overemphasized.

Review of Literature

Two general groups of literature address Homeland Security and citizenship norms, although both default to terrorism as the catalyst for all reinterpretations of citizenship. The first group of studies center around the work of Giorgio Agamben, who's conclusions about sovereign power indicate that punishment is meted out by the state to instill a chilling kind of fear in society to captivate individuals in the spectacle surrounding the absolute revocation of the rights of individuals and their exclusion from citizenship. Here, the terrorist is laid bare, the limit of exclusion from civilization. In the second area of research, critics attempt to take their explanation beyond the fear of terrorism and the state, illustrating how Homeland Security blurs

the citizen/terrorist distinction by conflating it with other categories of identity/difference. What is left relatively unexplored; however, is how Homeland Security might operate sans the figure of the terrorist, which would provide an understanding of how the conditions that make possible Homeland Security may have been in place before 9/11. The following sections review how these previous works understand the relationship between citizenship and terrorism in the evolving world of Homeland Security.

Bare Life

Donald Pease (2003) provided a succinct analysis of the changes in the state form embodied in the emergence of the biopolitical Homeland Security State. For Pease, the locus of these changes resides in the state's classification of the entire American population as "unprotected biological life" (p. 12). Through this endeavor, the state garners the capacity to categorize individuals into the classifications of those worthy of protection and those who jeopardize the biological well-being of the social body (Pease, 2003). Pease turns to Italian philosopher Agamben to plot the stakes in this expanding logic of sovereignty, claiming that the exclusion of individuals from citizenship results in their relocation to zones of exclusion where the state deprives them of all rights and exacts a brutal spectacle of punishment and killing. Agamben (1998) argued that the distinction between the rights of citizens and the rights of people in general serves as the basis for a form of exclusion predicated on *bare life*. The question of individual rights becomes, for Agamben, solely about defining the distinction between citizens and other individuals. Two criteria determine the nature of sovereignty: the birth into a particular territory and the birth from citizen parents (Agamben, 1998). In other words, sovereignty resides in the citizenry who are connected by land and blood, and the atrocities of state power, such as those carried out under National Socialism, result from a

redefinition of who these people are not (p. 130). At the limit point of this difference, the body of *homo sacer*, or the ultimate exclusion from law, becomes the site where sovereign power controls life and death over a body that “may be killed and yet not sacrificed” (p. 8). In modern democracy, the state of exception becomes the norm, and in the post 9/11 United States, the terrorist is *homo sacer* who might even live in the body of the citizen. For Agamben, the space of the concentration camp “is the new hidden regulator of the inscription of life in the order - or, rather, the sign of the system’s inability to function without being transformed into a lethal machine” (p. 175). Amy Kaplan (2003) agreed with this diagnosis, contending specifically that “We may be facing a danger today that the lawless status of Guantanamo Bay will become more of a norm rather than an anomaly, that homeland security depends not on drawing strict boundaries between home and abroad, but on these mobile, ambiguous spaces between the domestic and the foreign” (p. 92). This thesis attempts to supplement these works on the emerging changes to sovereignty and the state form by looking beyond the concept of the sovereign spectacle as the primary normalizing mechanism for Homeland Security. To this end, this work aims to flesh out the ways in which individual citizens encounter Homeland Security in their everyday lives.

Other critics add to this interpretation, contending that the globalized nature of contemporary security threats results in frequently violent reinscriptions of the sovereign state as its population hedges against the chaos of the international system (Aretxaga, 2002; Mbembe, 2003; Milbank, 2002). This general line of argument centering around sovereign power tends to couch normalization to the sacrifice of rights in terms of mythology. For many of these scholars (Pease, 2003; Rajiva, 2006; Spigel, 2004; Steinmetz, 2003), propaganda and the narrative structure of myths operate as the enabling mechanisms for the normative prioritization of

security over individual rights. For some (Drew, 2002; Pease, 2003), the myths equate the attacks of 9/11 to the deflowering of the virgin American soil, thus coding the social body as feminine, vulnerable, and weak. In response, the U.S. government mobilizes the aggressive masculinization of citizenship through mythological crisis rhetoric (Drew, 2002). In another example, Rajiva (2006) compared the new state form to the myth of Prometheus, identifying the neoconservative academic front of the Bush administration as Prometheans who stole fire from the gods on Mount Olympus. Instead of focusing on law breakers, the neoconservatives challenge the establishment with their fire, or rather with their pragmatic optimism in technology and their calls for the centralization of the defense establishment (Rajiva, 2006). In short, “Since overt coercion would be unacceptable and since only a handful of elites can be bribed into complicity by tangible rewards, it is the force of myth-making that allows the state to rewrite detentions and torture outside its boundaries as well as allow repression within it as the inevitable and virtuous operation of the law” (p. 134). Still, all of these scholars read Homeland Security in terms of its dependence on the figure of international terrorism. Moreover, these works place citizens at the mercy of a dominating group of elites who use rhetoric to maintain social control, which rules out the question of how citizenship is enacted and instead replaces it with the question of how leaders exert domination.

Pease (2003) added another dimension to the mythological approach, claiming that normalization results from both the fear of insecurity and the captivation of society through spectacle. Society becomes an audience enthralled with the ultimate form of punishment directed against an enemy who challenges the regulatory myths that tie together the social fabric. In short, the raw display of sovereign power maintains order and purifies the American narrative. Pease also argues that the Bush administration alters “the regulatory fictions through which

government policymakers exercise normative control over the population” (p. 1). In other words, by revealing the mutable dimensions of mytho-logic, Pease demonstrated how the state manipulates myths through fear to normalize society to increasing levels of control. Additional voices (Clark, 2004; De Beaugrande, 2004) placed normalization in the hands of an elite, sovereign leadership, arguing that leaders control society by coupling a rhetoric of fear to an ideological doublespeak in order to destabilize and deceive society. This conception of Homeland Security, although exploring how myths alter citizenship, still relies on terrorism to ground its claims. From this viewpoint, leaders are understood to manipulate the narrative of terrorism to build a myth of the people, and the possibility of Homeland Security citizenship outside the citizen/terrorist logic is pushed to the wayside.

Beyond Bare Life

Some scholars back away from Agamben’s (1998) conclusion that sovereignty and discipline have collapsed into one another at the point of bare life, and attempt to explain Homeland Security in different terms. Consistent with Michael Hardt’s (2000) suggestion that “posing the extreme case of the concentration camp as the heart of sovereignty... tends to obscure the daily violence of modern sovereignty in all its forms” (§ 14), these critics separate out the individualizing and totalizing effects of modern political rationality in order to understand alternate articulations that connect the two. This line of argument focuses on subjectivity, or what Foucault (1988a) calls the technology of the self, but steps away from the vertical connection of discipline and sovereignty theorized by Agamben. Instead, these works take note of the changes brought to capitalism by postmodernity; meaning rather than looking only to the logic of the camp and understanding sovereignty through the binary of inclusion/exclusion, these pieces focus roughly around what Hardt couches as rule “through

mechanisms of differential inclusion” that makes “hierarchies of hybrid identities” (¶ 15). These individualized techniques of normalization to security tend toward invisibility because of their diffusion throughout society, yet the subject becomes highly visible (Athanasiou, 2003). Critics following the transformation of sovereignty in postmodern capitalism center around the shifting conceptions of economy, territory, and identity endemic to neoliberalism.

The globalization of free market economics permeates all aspects of life, eroding the levels of control possible by traditional nation-states. Jameson (2002) asserted that terrorism itself constitutes a product of globalization and is even tantamount to anti-globalization. For example, the 9/11 strikes on the World Trade Center symbolized an attack on icons of the global market (Jameson, 2002). In addition, the employment of moral absolutes and the constant coding of emergency time as fear both compel society to prioritize the value of security, especially when both actions are couched in terms of safeguarding property (Giroux, 2004, 2005; Jameson, 2002).

For Walters (2004), the key to the emergence of citizen-subjects who value security over rights lies in the production of trust. Terming the techniques that normalize individuals to new security developments as *domopolitics*, Walters argued that the state governs “individuals as a home.” As will be further discussed below, this logic equates the reinscription of borders to combat globalized threats with antivirus software for personal computers. The individual trusts the security mechanisms in the software to protect his/her property. In the same fashion, the state’s security machine may be trusted to yield similar results, letting in the good people and keeping out the bad. Moreover, a safe home is warm and inviting, meaning that state security protects an enticing life of comfort for legitimate citizens. Isin (2004) echoed Walters argument, claiming that the increasing focus on border securitization associated with Homeland Security

represents a peak in a long process of the normalization of individuals to security. Like Passavant (2005), Isin claims that the individual desire for security in everyday life produces the conditions for a state that governs individuals as consumers. Importantly, Isin added that this type of government of individuals is not only about the rational calculations citizens make about their welfare, but also that their neuroses come into play. Isin envisions a *neurotic citizen*, confused about her/his rights and driven to make decisions on emotional grounds. The neurotic citizen's relationship to the revaluation of security over rights takes on material dimensions in the work of David Campbell (2005), who located the Sport Utility Vehicle (SUV) as a nodal point connecting individuals, security, culture, the state, and the global economy.

For Campbell (2005), the idea of the state is performatively constituted through the “boundary producing political performances of foreign policy” (p. 948). Campbell traced the genealogy of the SUV to the Jeep, a vehicle made famous by the United States military in the wake of World War II. This lineage allows the SUV owner to live a fantasy of vehicular freedom because of the rugged nature of the vehicle itself, yet the owner operates with a sense of insecurity about the surrounding world for which the SUV offers defense. In other words, operating a vehicle designed for war zones entangles the owner in a history of militaristic and patriotic norms. Moreover, because the SUV brings with it the idea of immediate spatial security for individuals, it embodies the unbundling of locales, the fracturing of communities, and the increasing capsularization of society. In short, the SUV owner finds him/herself distanced from her/his local community in a fashion similar to the distancing of outside places by American foreign policy. Citizens retreat into their families and the sanctuary of the home in order to remain safe in an increasingly chaotic world. Campbell (2005) introduced another inviting facet of normalization besides a safe home when he discussed the status associated with SUVs.

Owners of SUVs occupy a relatively upper-class status in American society not only because of the price of the vehicles but also because of the steadily increasing prices of oil and gasoline. The SUV offers the material embodiment of pride. In the end; however, pride and fear are intimately bound to one another, since the SUV's technological prowess can be understood as a response to a culture permeated with crisis and fear. This fear permeates all of the works discussed thus far in this section, and is bound to the image of international terrorism. Whether in the context of domestic politics, the neuroses of citizenship, or the safety of an SUV; an ominous vision of terrorist attack grounds the reinterpretation of Homeland Security citizenship.

In another effort to understand the play of categories of identity/difference in the sense making that normalizes American society to Homeland Security, Jasbir Puar and Amit Rai (2002) discussed the centrality of gender and sexuality to the War on Terror, seeking to explain how this new type of war alters preexistent technologies of nationalism, heteronormativity, and white supremacy. Taking Foucault's figure of monstrosity as a starting point for criticism, Puar and Rai traced the reemergence of the monster in academic discourses surrounding the study of terrorism. Specifically, Puar and Rai argued that a knowledge of sexual perversity grounds the construct of the terrorist, and that normalization fosters aggressive, heteronormative patriotism. In other words, the norm of a civilized subject provides the basis for quarantining a sexualized and racialized other. In this case, the enabling mechanism for the prioritization of Homeland Security over individual rights is "the construction of the pathologized psyche of the terrorist monster" (Puar and Rai, 2002, p. 117). This construction of a terrorist psyche explains in part why Americans allow the use of racial profiling as a blunt targeting tool for weeding out potential terrorists from good citizens (Maira, 2004), yet still relies on terrorism to construct Homeland Security citizenship. In another work, Puar and Rai (2004) extend this discussion,

tying the sexual and racial norms of Homeland Security to the global economy and production of myth. Civilization exists as a nodal point that justifies the valuation of security over individual protections both because of the fact that its “future-oriented, market-savvy subjective forms are produced through normalization practices,” and also because the idea of a civilized people relies on “an implicitly Christian cosmology” that “gives its adherents a sense of mission” (Puar and Rai, 2004, p. 94). Salaita (2005) identified the narrative threads behind this notion of citizenship with a settler mentality and the idea of a divine mission. This divine mission; however, still depends on a terrorist figure to embody the evil of this good/evil logic. These works add several important dimensions to the sense making matrix of Homeland Security, since they indicate how heterosexist, white supremacist, and Christian norms are attached to the citizen/terrorist distinction. These norms constitute an ideal of civilization that gives individuals in the United States a form of collective selfhood against which violence may be justified to eradicate an internal threat to the civilized way of life (Noorani, 2005). In this last group of works, the focus rests on the ways in which rhetoric nuances the citizen/terrorist binary. The next few pieces discussed display an attempt to formulate Homeland Security outside of the citizen/terrorist binary.

For Henry Giroux (2004), the commercialization of society leads to governance through crime, in which the neoliberal state¹ provides protection for the social body vis-à-vis security of the market. As a result of this merger of the interests of state, society, and market; neoliberalism disarms society, taking away its capacity to change the revaluation of state security because the importance of the market trumps all other societal concerns (Giroux, 2004). In addition, an attack on the global economy constitutes an attack on the social body. The dense network of ties between state, society, and market faces an enemy that consists of an intricate web of

interconnected yet often independent cells. In this complex of relations, identification of enemies becomes a murky prospect at best, forcing a kind of war that demands the proliferation and sophistication of surveillance practices and information sharing between institutions of government and the market in order to achieve success (Passavant, 2005). In terms of the normalization of society to Homeland Security within this network war, Passavant (2005) went beyond fear or patriotic sacrifice, contending that the desires of consumption also play a pivotal role. His work dovetails with other scholars (Berrettini, 2002; Turner, 1998) have explained the desirability of surveillance in American popular culture. From reality television's displays of intimacy to the camera-intensive parking lots of mega-malls and the serenity of gated communities, society is embroiled in a love affair with surveillance and security. People want to feel safe when they shop or spend time at home, yet at the same time society relishes the use of similar mechanisms of surveillance to dive into other people's lives. Passavant characterized this societal turn as a "shift towards post-disciplinary *societies of control*" (§ 9) where the new technologies of communication lay, in a very material sense, the foundation for increased surveillance of the social body. In terms of both production and consumption, information serves as the key organizing component. Credit ratings, plastic money, databasing, networking, information processing, and security cameras in public areas all combine to interlock society, market, and surveillance. The role of Homeland Security emerges as that of a guardian that shields consumers from crime and frees them to chase the intricate details of their voyeuristic longings. For Passavant, this governance through crime positions state leaders as market ideologues who enable normalization through public address that panders to the fear of crime and the desires of consumption. At work in this theorization of Homeland Security is an abstraction of terrorism, where terrorism and general criminality are conflated into a singular

threat to consumerism. In each of these pieces in the last group, consumerism is attached to a form of citizenship that faces the threat of terrorism, albeit an increasingly abstracted threat.

In all of the works discussed in this review, the various articulations of Homeland Security citizenship depend on finessing the citizen/terrorist distinction. This study seeks to evaluate the necessity of terrorism in defining citizenship in the age of Homeland Security. Before proceeding in this direction; however, some theoretical debts must be paid. To this end, the next section reviews the role of identity/difference in the field of rhetorical studies.

Approach to Criticism

Barbara Biesecker (1989) ushered in a reinterpretation of the rhetorical situation on the grounds that confining rhetoric to the role of a mediator between speaker and audience denies that rhetoric can produce identities. Drawing from the work of Jaques Derrida, Biesecker introduced the rhetorical situation to the concept of *differance*, or the fundamental non-identity responsible for all signification. Reading, writing, and speaking are only possible within an economy of *differance* that creates hierarchies of identity/difference. In the same fashion subjectivity is an effect of location within this economy, meaning the condition of possibility for any subjectivity depends on the play of *differance*. Rhetoric, therefore, can be understood within a logic of articulation. Biesecker explained that:

If the subject is shifting and unstable (constituted in and by the play of *differance*), then the rhetorical event may be seen as an incident that produces and reproduces the identities of subjects and constructs and reconstructs the linkages between them (p. 126).

This read of the rhetorical situation as articulation puts the identity of the audience in constant flux, taking the explanative power of criticism beyond the demystification of conditions of domination, since:

articulation is not about collapsing the distinction between materiality and meaning to advance a specific critical project; it is about historicizing different configurations of materiality and meaning (collapsed, segregated, overlapping) as conditions for the coming into being of a given form of rhetoric (Stormer, 2004, p. 261).

Approached from this perspective, rhetoric produces language, bodies, and spaces as its effects, and engages in a constant process of becoming through the production, linking, de-linking, and arranging of material and semiotic elements into logics of sense-making for everyday life (Stormer, 2004).

This line of criticism follows the work of Raymie McKerrow (1989), who although not directly tending to audience, initiated a project with tremendous impact for the ways in which critics tend to the subject. Claiming that the criticism of ideology is a performative practice, McKerrow proposed that rhetorical criticism ought be called *critical rhetoric*. This move inverts the term *public address*, arguing instead that critics should “reconceptualize the endeavor to focus attention on *that symbolism which addresses publics*” (p. 101). The significance of McKerrow’s work for the understanding of audience lies in his turn to Foucault, and the idea that power takes the form of norms that seem natural and rational. McKerrow brings together the Marxist theory of ideology, or the symbolic means a group of elites executes in order to dominate the masses of the lower-class, with Foucault’s work on the nature of discourse and power. The goal of critical rhetoric becomes an escape from Platonic conceptions of truth and universality. Instead of wedding the process of criticism to “universal standards of reasoning” that position rhetoric as the servant of a grander order of reason, McKerrow (1989) contended that the world is relativistic and contingent (p. 91). McKerrow argued that rhetoric should be considered as *doxastic* in order to allow the locus of criticism “to shift to how... symbols come

to possess power- what they ‘do’ in society as opposed to what they ‘are’” (p.104). For McKerrow, critical practice seeks to understand the ways in which power/knowledge is integrated into society, to look for how this integration both invites and inhibits change, and to uncover possible strategies for critical intervention to impact social change. This perspective positions rhetoric as a logic of sense-making that takes place in the context of everyday life, through what McKerrow highlights as a redefinition of the Aristotelian conception of *phronesis*, or practical reason. For McKerrow, *phronesis* encompassed the myriad ways in which social relations take on a sense of reality for the individuals entangled in their webs. In other words, McKerrow offered a view of audience as normative social construct, constituted in discourse, and existent only in the rhetorical fictions that create the conditions for its possibility.

The clearest distinction between this kind of critical rhetoric and the work of those critics with a more Marxist tilt lies in the tension over truth and the materiality of discourse.² In a move that levies criticism against McKerrow in order to defend his turn to Foucault from the attacks of Dana Cloud, Ron Greene (1998) asserted that although McKerrow’s vision of rhetorical agency promises to unlock potential avenues for social change, the problem with his two-tier critique rests in its focus on revealing conditions of domination. Greene (1998) attacked McKerrow’s definition of practical reasoning, claiming that merely relating individuals to rhetorical fictions reduces the power of practical reasoning to its representation in rhetorical practices. This move limits all transformative activities to the world of rhetorical constitution, thus ruling out the possibility of manifestations of rhetoric in multiple modalities. Greene rejected this logic, which he terms a “logic of representation,” specifying that we need to rethink practical reasoning in Foucauldian terms by viewing it as human technologies, or the purposeful organization of human forces with other forces into systems of power. This understanding of rhetoric as articulation

allows the critic to explore the multidimensional effectivity of rhetoric as a technology of deliberation.

Greene's criticism responded to Cloud's (2004) contention that critical rhetoric should "retain notions of the real; of the material; and of the structured, stable, and dominating" (p. 159). Cloud's version of critical rhetoric, Greene (1998) argued, slides into a logic of influence guided by a bipolar model of power that assumes rhetoric as a mediating force between the ruling elite and the masses of the lower class. In short, rhetoric becomes a tool through which speaking subjects use language to generate material effects. This criticism of Cloud also indicts the assumptions about rhetoric displayed in the first section of the literature review above, since those works tended to rely on the ability of leaders to woo the masses with myth. As a corrective to this oversimplified model, Greene (1998) turns to Foucault to escape the assumption that domination exists as the only effect of discourses of power. Foucault argued that power is productive, and:

What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn't only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse (Foucault, 1980, p.119).

Investigating the political technology of individuals unlocks the possibility of grasping how we have been programmed to "recognize ourselves as a society, as a part of a social entity, as a part of a nation or of a state" (Foucault, 1988b, p. 146). This alternative coupling of Foucault and Marx provides the possibility of escaping McKerrow's logic of representation and Cloud's reliance on influence while still excavating the relationships among individuals, the social body, and the formation of the state. In other words, discourse theory meets Marxism at the individual, who is both the product of discourse and also the physical location of power's material effects.

With articulation, capitalism enters postmodernity. A globalized world economy presents problems for the traditional form of the nation-state. The densely interconnected global marketplace, dependent on the free flow of commodities and capital, ushered in changes in the state form. In order to maintain its efficacy, the state began a process Foucault (1991) termed *governmentalization*. Foucault outlined a three-tiered model of governmentality. The first tier consists of the utilization of political economy to create a population of efficient producers (Foucault, 1991; Miller, 1998). The second includes the series of governmental apparatuses which create the necessary conditions for productivity. The third deals with the process through which the state of justice has been transformed into an administrative state, a technology for societal welfare (Foucault, 1991; Miller, 1998). The dispersion of mechanisms of power throughout the social body has transformed not only the functions of government, but also the roles of labor, production, and consumption. Governmentality targets the social body, and takes as its primary concern “the ability to make people manufacture goods by the most rational allocation of resources available” (Miller, 1998, p. 16). Hardt and Negri (1994) linked the dwindling importance of the factory as a site of production to the dissemination of technologies of production throughout society, claiming that the social body now finds itself “permeated through and through with the regime of the factory, that is, with the rules of the specifically capitalist relations of production” (p. 10). This diffusion of labor into the social implicates communication as a crucial element in production, since communication links the individual to the social body and to governing apparatuses (Greene, 2004; Hardt & Negri, 2000). In postmodern capitalism, rhetoric becomes a communicative labor, a biopolitical technology that redefines the role of communication into “a material history of production and living labor” (Greene, 2004, p. 202). In this sense, rhetoric operates in multiple modalities, becoming a

“practice, process, and product of economic, political, ideological, and cultural value” (Greene, 2004, p. 202).

Following Greene’s turn to Foucault, this study investigates the logic(s) of identity/difference that make possible the normalization of Homeland Security in the social body, questioning specifically the necessity of terrorism in producing docile Homeland Security citizens.

Preview of Chapters

As a result of the focus of this thesis, the need arises for an object of study that cuts across the vast majority of American public culture, instead of one that deals only with the extremes of the citizen/terrorist divide. Furthermore, the object of this study must exhibit the removal or increasing abstraction of the figure of the terrorist in decisionmaking about Homeland Security. The USDHS *Ready* program for citizen preparedness demonstrates this strategic play, and is also the material conduit through which Homeland Security meets American citizens. In order to follow the play of identity/difference in this abstraction of terrorism, the next two chapters will flesh out the details and differences between two specific *Ready* products. Specifically, this work will examine the 2004 Homeland Security Guide printed in the *Verizon Superpages*, and also a variety of materials included in the Ready Kids program for American public schools. The number of differences between the Homeland Security Guide and *Ready Kids* are based on what Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff terms “age appropriate” considerations (USDHS, 2006c). These differences censor openly the use of fear in *Ready Kids* in order to avoid the trauma that might affect children, meaning that *Ready* provides a site for comparing the use of terrorism as a catalyst for normative evaluations about Homeland Security.

Chapter 2 investigates the constructions of citizenship in the Homeland Security Guide, a manual for citizen preparedness saturated with the threat of international terrorism. The rhetorical significance of this manual lies not only in its overt configuration of preparedness logic around terrorism, but also in its widespread circulation throughout American society. Verizon was the largest telecom company in existence at the time of the 2004 Homeland Security Guide's publication (Niccolai & Gross, 2005), and the Guide also appeared in the *Superpages*, which were delivered to the doors of all Verizon customers. A U.S. District Court noted statistical evidence indicating that substantially more individuals use the Verizon Superpages than its leading competitor (SuperPagesFacts.com, 2004), meaning that the Homeland Security Guide appears in an implement employed by a significant number of people in their day-to-day lives. In addition, fundamental symbols of American patriotism permeate the Homeland Security Guide. Hariman and Lucaites (2002) noted that the "norms, interests, political effectivity, self-awareness, and substantive claims characterizing public culture are defined by the composition and circulation of texts (including words and images) through mass media or similar practices of dissemination" (p. 364); therefore, the *Ready* program's saturation into American life locates it as a significant object of study for understanding the normative changes that attend a rhetoric of Homeland Security couched in terms of an imminent terrorist threat. This chapter establishes a basis for comparison and evaluation of changes to the articulation of Homeland Security citizenship when the terrorist figure is removed from sense making.

Chapter 3 analyzes the production of citizenship when terrorism is absent from the practical reasoning of Homeland Security, looking in particular at the USDHS *Ready Kids* program. *Ready Kids* offers a unique site for attaining the goal of the chapter for several reasons.

Like the Homeland Security Guide, *Ready Kids* circulates heavily throughout the United States. On February 2, 2006, the Department of Homeland Security, in conjunction with the Ad Council, launched the *Ready Kids* program in schools across the United States (Zubek, 2006). This national public service advertising campaign focused on children between the ages of eight and twelve, and represents the latest element in the USDHS's *Ready* campaign that serves to educate the public on disaster prevention (USDHS, 2006a; Zubek, 2006). The *Ready* campaign's web site, already boasting around two billion hits since its inception in 2003, functions as a home base for the *Ready Kids* program, although *Ready Kids* celebrates even wider circulation (USDHS, 2006a). Scholastic, Inc., contracted by the DHS, developed a set of in-school resources for 4th, 5th, and 6th graders to be distributed in the twenty largest metropolitan areas in the United States (USDHS, 2006a). Over 135,000 teachers now hand out these materials in their classrooms, and the program also receives additional circulation thanks to the National PTA, the Boy Scouts of America, and the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. (Zubek, 2006). For students outside of larger cities the DHS makes the in-school items available through its *Ready* campaign's website, so any teacher with access to the internet can download and distribute the *Ready Kids* materials in their classrooms (USDHS, 2006a). Furthermore, *Ready Kids* makes an overt claim to be a tool for educating citizens about their individual roles in Homeland Security. The campaign targets educational institutions, meaning that it extends the logic of Homeland Security beyond the realm of actual citizens afforded legal rights to those future citizens in training. Symbols of patriotic unity are largely absent from *Ready Kids*; instead the nation is written as a purely territorial body. In other words, it deals with an exclusion not defined by the limits of citizen/terrorist, but rather with one that deals in terms other than bare life.

Chapter 4 will discuss the finding, implications, and shortcomings of this investigation of

the USDHS *Ready* program's selective deployment of international terrorism, as well as directions for future research.

CHAPTER 2

TERRORISM AND THE HOMELAND SECURITY GUIDE

Introduction

In 1995, fourteen year-old Joe Blom slipped on ice on his way home from school, impaling himself on a drumstick in his pocket that sank ten inches deep, pierced his lungs, and brushed his heart (Janz, 1995). Joe picked himself up and walked home, stick still protruding from his side (Janz, 1995). He was rushed to the hospital where he battled for his life for several days, before waking up and writing the words, “There goes my perfect attendance” (§ 3). The accident threw the schedules of everyone in the Blom family out of whack, and in their time away from the house someone took advantage of the situation, cleaning out the Blom home in a robbery (Janz, 1995). Fortunately, this story has a happy ending. The Blom’s neighbors banded together to donate enough food and money to get the family back on their feet (Janz, 1995).

Three important life lessons emerge in this story. First, no one was going to help Joe other than Joe. In other words, when an accident happens we can learn from Joe’s courage and do our best to take care of ourselves. Second, a strong community working together can take care of its own members. Because the Blom’s had produced strong relationships with their neighbors, the impact of the disaster was mitigated. Third, living in the right neighborhood insures your neighbors will have cash on-hand to help you out in a pinch. These common sense lessons about emergencies manifest throughout the 2004 *Verizon Superpages* Homeland Security Guide, a manual offering instructions about citizen preparedness for terrorist attacks. Before exploring their emergence in the Homeland Security Guide; however, the significance of these life lessons for this study of audience becomes necessary. In order to assess a deeper sense of how these common sense lessons relate to theorizations of audience from rhetorical studies, the

role of governing apparatuses in the articulation of citizenship must first be unpacked.

Foucault (1988a) argued that the use of symbols exists as only one of four types of human technologies: production, sign systems, power, and the self. Each of these matrices of practical reason, or technologies, function in tandem with the others to constitute and distribute subject positions and governing apparatuses (Foucault, 1988a). As a mixture of human technologies devoted to improving the welfare of a population, a governing apparatus programs a web of institutions to connect a population to a policy (Greene, 1998). The key to a governing apparatus is its means of making visible a population on who's behalf interventions must be made in order to improve societal welfare (Greene, 1998). Rhetoric serves as the lynchpin in the organization of a governing apparatus, since rhetoric's publicity effect functions to both make visible a population and also to program the menu of judgments that population makes about its own behavior. The functioning of a given apparatus depends on to what extent "rhetoric contributes to panopticism as a technology of power" (Greene, 1998, p. 31). In short, rhetoric makes visible a whole way of life, capturing it in a *stasis* and programming temporal regularities between individuals, society, and governing apparatuses in order to create the conditions for a series of institutions to govern a population. This making visible of a lifestyle takes on specific, material dimensions in an array of everyday institutional connections.

Several of these apparatuses warrant special concern for this investigation of the Homeland Security Guide, since they all intersect in *Ready*'s articulation of a prepared citizen. Greene (1998) drew from Althusser's (2001) distinction between the "Repressive State Apparatus" (RSA) and "Ideological State Apparatuses" (ISAs) to argue that rhetoric manifests in material form in the configurations of institutions. ISAs include, but are not limited to, the family, the educational system, mass communication, and the political complex (Althusser, 2001,

p. 96). If these apparatuses are understood as instruments in the government of a population, and the population is the audience, then the ways that rhetoric programs individuals and normative judgments about the population into governing apparatuses becomes the most relevant location to answer the central question of this thesis. In short, the normalization of individuals aims at the benefit of the population, but occurs in the localized, material context of governing apparatuses where identity/difference undergirds the judgments made about society. These judgments result from contestations over meaning; therefore this study, in attending to McKerrow's (1989) goal of escaping the Platonic telos of truth, turns away from attempts to unmask the truth behind Homeland Security, and instead focuses on the tension among different interpretations of Homeland Security citizenship. As McGee (2001) described it:

Plato's criticism of rhetoric emphasizes its easy acceptance of appearance and lack of concern for truth. Rhetoricians such as Isocrates did recognize clear tension between appearance and reality, but they described it as *opposition*, not as *contradiction*. That is, when different modes of interpretation are also at odds, each claiming to be true, rhetoricians saw a *stasis*, an impasse resolved when judges imbued with *phronesis* (practical wisdom) make decisions. Plato doubted the practical wisdom of the Athenian *polis* that usually made such judgments, claiming that decisions are often polluted by the superstition and fear of uncritical minds. He wanted a more reliable, certain criterion of truth, so he invented philosophical thinking by characterizing an opposition as more than *stasis*, as *krisis*, a contradiction that results from the imperfection of language. (§ 5)

The difference for this study rests in these concepts of *stasis* and *phronesis*. Instead of seeking the truth and considering society as easily swayed by fear, this approach to criticism sees truth as contingent and identity/difference as crucial to making intelligible the judgments for

which society is the arbiter.

These insights underscore the significance of the *Ready* program in the production of Homeland Security citizens. As discussed in Chapter 1, the *Ready* program exists as a nodal point, linking individual behavior, corporate interests, education, public culture, and the state. For this reason, *Ready* offers this study a more multifaceted tool for criticism than a public address or a piece of propaganda, since it concerns the localized interactions of Homeland Security with the behaviors and attitudes of individuals. Like the story of the Blom family, the Homeland Security Guide presents a citizen-subject who, when presented with a life or death emergency, can overcome through depending on the self, producing strong community relations, and living in an socially and economically privileged neighborhood. The following sections examine how the Homeland Security Guide combines elements of national unity, consumer citizenship, and social networking to articulate a prepared citizen in the War on Terror.

National Unity

In April of 2004, the Maytag Aircraft Corporation terminated the employment of Tami Silicio after pictures she captured of flag-draped caskets, supposedly containing the bodies of U.S. soldiers who died in Iraq, appeared in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer (Overington, 2004). Images of these caskets manifest rarely in the national media, so this instance sparked an immediate firestorm of controversy. The Bush administration protested, arguing that the release of the photos constituted an egregious violation of the families' privacy ("Bush backs," 2006). Opponents contended, through an analogy to Viet Nam, that the caskets held the potential to quell the American people's support for the war ("Bush backs," 2004). The warrant for this argument - the flag hits home. In sum, the visibility of a primary symbol of American unity within this salient political context exposed a rhetorical battleground over interpretation. Bush

was not the first president to restrict media access to images of fallen soldiers returning home, and in fact followed what has become a relatively strict protocol on the issue (Overington). This controversy illuminates what is at stake in controlling the context in which individual Americans connect with potent symbols of collectivity. Hariman and Lucaites (2002) explained that the very existence of:

the modern nation-state requires transference of passionate identification with local, embodied, organic institutions to a superordinate, procedural governmentality, and this shift is accomplished in part through images of virtual embodiment that simultaneously reframe locality within a national context while grounding national symbols in the social experience of everyday life (p. 367).

In other words, these symbols attach tangible dimensions to the everyday experience of citizenship. The bodies of fallen soldiers return to their hometowns, families, and homes. Bush's appeal to privacy for the families not only highlights the potential for images of American unity to frame how individuals address questions of national politics, but also articulates a lucid relationship between the federal government and the family apparatus. This relationship revolves around a failed ritual sacrifice, in which Americans give their lives honorably to provide for the needs of the nation in crisis despite the lack of a decisive resolution to the military conflict (Marvin, 2005).

The Homeland Security Guide taps into the connection between citizenship and sacrifice by linking individual practices to powerful symbols of American unity. A quote from Tom Ridge, acting director of the DHS at the time of the Homeland Security Guide's publication, opens the document, connecting immediately the interests of the nation and the individual through practical reason. Appearing at the top of the first page just above the "Step 1" textbox,

Ridge's words arrest the eye with a contrast of large, bolded, and italicized black letters against a stark white background. Ridge's quotation stands out in form from all the other written elements of the Homeland Security Guide, pronouncing "Terrorism forces us to make a choice. We can be afraid. Or we can be ready" (Verizon, 2004, p. 196). The words just above Ridge's quote bridge the national choice on terrorism to the preparedness practices of individuals by emphasizing that in the case of "Homeland Security. Preparing Makes Sense. Get Ready Now" (p. 196). On the banner running across the top of both of the document's pages, three symbols situate the statement preceding Ridge's statement. At the far right, the Statue of Liberty stands next to the words "Homeland Security" (p. 197). The opposite end of the banner displays the official seal of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Both the statue and the seal are superimposed over an image of the American flag that runs the length of the banner upon which the words above Ridge's quotation appear near the center. These three symbols articulate a context for citizen preparedness that couches the claims of the Homeland Security Guide in a history of unity and obligatory sacrifice.

The American flag exists as:

a field of multiple projections ... direct assertions of territorial conquest and possession, totemic evocations of blood sacrifice, demands for political loyalty to suppress dissent, representations of consensus, tokens of political participation, articulations of civil religion, ornamental signs of civic bonding amid a summer festival, and affirmations of political identity and rights while dissenting (Hariman & Lucaites, 2002, p. 371).

Since 9/11, mainstream American media has exploited the potential of the flag to link patriotic norms to citizenship. Tom Franklin's photo of firefighters raising the flag at Ground Zero connected the collective memory of World War II patriotism to the War on Terror by

serving as an analogue to Joe Rosenthal's iconic "Flag Raising on Iwo Jima" (Spratt, Peterson, & Lagos, 2005). Cable news channels attached the flag to their station identities, producing an environment in which anchors could refer to American military policy as *ours* or talk about what *we* should do to win the War on Terror (Potter, 2002). In general, the conduits of the media produced a veritable barrage of ties between the flag and patriotic citizenship (Hutcheson, Domke, Billeaudeaux, & Garland, 2004; McMellon & Long, 2006). In the Homeland Security Guide, the flag appears in both the banner across the top, and also in the bottom-right hand corner in the "Step 4" textbox that contains the final step of the written instructions. "Step 4" prompts the individual to:

Be prepared to adapt this information to your personal circumstances and make every effort to follow instructions received from authorities on the scene. Above all, stay calm, be patient and think before you act. With these simple preparations, you can be ready for the unexpected. If you have a working smoke detector, you understand that preparing makes sense. Get ready now. (Verizon, 2004, p. 197)

The individual hailed in the Homeland Security Guide faces a choice predicated on the constant, imminent threat of terrorism. Citizenship requires patience and common sense about survival in the event of attack, as well as blind obedience to authorities. Here, the citizen meets the police state at the front door. The fire analogy conjures images of firefighters entering to save a home after the family responds to the alarm and evacuates, and then attaches these images to USDHS response teams. In addition, the flag muddies the local/federal distinction, equating USDHS personnel with neighborhood firefighters, and connecting patriotic duty to docile citizenship.

Images of the American flag access collective memories of patriotism and reverence, but

another image outlines the implications of the choice to be made by good citizens. At stake in this decision is the very ability to choose. The Statue of Liberty in the top right-hand corner of the Homeland Security Guide is a “fundamental symbol of American identity” (Procter, 1990, p. 120). Not only does the statue link the Homeland Security Guide to collective memories of American individualism, but it also produces a geographical connection to 9/11. As a symbol attached to the image of New York City, the statue links memories of 9/11 to the everyday practices of citizenship. In other words, the Statue of Liberty localizes the defense of individual freedom against the terrorist who would take it away.

At work in the combination of these iconic national symbols and individual duty is a political technology of citizenship that depends on the production of individuality in contradistinction to the state (Clifford, 2001). Two additional symbols crystallize this relationship. The USDHS seal appears in the top left-hand corner, marking explicitly the specific government agency in charge of bearing this type of political knowledge. On the right, just above the first step of the instructions, the words “Homeland Security Guide” (Verizon, 2004, p. 196) anchor a more abstract depiction of an eagle. In medieval combat, where warriors shielded their faces from danger with steel helmets, the invention of the system of heraldry provided a way to distinguish friend from foe in the heat of battle (“Heraldry,” 2006). The shield, or *escutcheon*, served as the centerpiece of the warrior’s defensive equipment, and also operated as the most visible form of identification because of its larger size relative to the other components (“Heraldry,” 2006). Despite the modernization of warfare, remnants of heraldry endure. The DHS seal incorporates several elements of heraldry in its design. The seal is a derivative of the Great Seal of the United States (USDHS, 2003b), commissioned originally in 1776 as, “an emblem and national coat of arms to give visible evidence of a sovereign nation and

a free people” (USDS, 2003, p. 1). The spread eagle, present in the center of both seals, holds a bundle of arrows in its left talon and an olive branch in its right. These symbols, as appropriated from the system of heraldry by the United States federal government, are intended to signify the concepts of war and peace (USDS, 2003; Velde, 2003). The eagle shows the state as the arbiter of war and peace, defending the social body from the inevitable fracture of war among groups. In a more specific manner, the spread eagle to the right of Ridge’s quote in the Homeland Security Guide, although not bearing the arrows and olive branch, attaches additional connotation. Three red stars hover above this golden eagle’s head. Present in similar U.S. seals after 9/11, these stars have been used to signify the three points of attack on American soil, and their relationship to the eagle can be understood as a metaphor for the defense of the homeland by the state (USNC, 2006). Coupled with Ridge’s quote identifying terrorism as an imminent threat to the population’s well-being, the stars and the golden eagle connect the current War on Terror to the long history of wars involving the United States. In addition, the seal, in a fashion similar to the heraldic function of the *escutcheon*, reifies the inside/outside relationship between the U.S. and other sovereign states embodied in the Great Seal. The Great Seal of the United States, defined as a specific signifier of the state through legal prohibitions on its replication and use (Velde, 2003), marks materially the difference of the U.S. from all other states through its presence on all formal inter-state treaties and agreements (USDS, 2003). Here, the differentiation between states, as well as the expression of war as a historical inevitability, evidence Foucault’s (1988b) conception of the relationship between politics and history characteristic of the *raison of state*. The state exists in a constant game of competition with other collectives, and the history of the population is attached to the forging of its own uniqueness through the political struggles of the state.

Several differences between the USDHS seal and the Great Seal; however, illustrate the changing political technology of citizenship within the rubric of Homeland Security. First, the wings of the eagle on the DHS seal, unlike those of their counterpart on the Great Seal, break through the surrounding ring, which suggests, according to the USDHS (2003), that the Department, “will break through traditional bureaucracy and perform government functions differently” (§ 3). This breaking through of bureaucracy references the centralization of numerous Executive agencies into one single entity. Similarly, the second difference between the two seals relates to this concept of centralization. On the Great Seal of the United States, the eagle holds a ribbon in its beak inscribed with the Latin phrase, *E Pluribus Unum*, intended to signify “Out of many, one” (USDS, 2003, p. 15). The eagle of the DHS seal, on the other hand, carries no ribbon. Instead, an inscription on the ring surrounding the eagle reads, “U.S. Department of Homeland Security” (Verizon, 2004, p. 196). In this case, the absence of the explicit appearance of *E Pluribus Unum* on the DHS seal holds minimal significance, since other signifiers on the seal connect it to the same notion of many becoming one. For example, the bundle of arrows and the leaves of the olive branch, present on both seals, are intended to signify unity among individuals (USDS, 2003; USDHS, 2003). In addition, the USDHS claims that the constellation of twenty-two stars in the escutcheon worn on the eagle’s chest signifies the consolidation of multiple agencies into one central institution. The Great Seal, in contrast, displays a constellation of thirteen stars above the eagle’s head intended, according to the U.S. Department of State (2003), to denote “a new state taking its place and rank among other sovereign powers” (p. 15). All of the aforementioned differences point to one key reinterpretation of citizenship in the War on Terror. The DHS seal relates more closely to unity within the state, while the Great Seal concerns the unity of the state itself in relation to other

sovereign entities. In sum, Homeland Security reinterprets the inside/outside dichotomy to be less a matter of the relationship between the U.S. and other states, and more an issue of the distinction between the state and what is not the state. Terrorism, in other words, could exist as an enemy within the state. Foucault (1982) described this progression, claiming that:

It is certain that in contemporary societies the state is not simply one of the forms or specific situations of the exercise of power – even if it is the most important – but that in a certain way all other forms of power relation must refer to it. But this is not because they are derived from it; it is rather because power relations have come more and more under state control... .
(p. 224)

What becomes clear from the symbols selected for the Homeland Security Guide is the importance of individual practices to the unity of the nation. The practices are not just humble support for the sacrifices made by U.S. troops overseas, but also locate a citizen who lives everyday life working to prepare for when the war hits home. Since World War II, sacrifice has been coupled with consumption in articulating wartime citizenship (Young, 2005). The Homeland Security Guide accesses this history of consumer citizenship, linking the patriotism associated with potent national symbols to citizenship performed through consumption.

Consumerism and Citizenship

The connection of citizenship to consumption has well over a hundred years of history in the United States (Dickinson, 2005). Freedom of choice between brands or types of goods has been conflated with the activation of citizenship, and since 9/11 corporations have bonded themselves to the good of the nation through charitable giving of a portion of profits earned from consumers (Dickinson, 2005). The Homeland Security Guide displays overtly this production of democracy as consumption. The image appearing twice in “Step 1” presents a white woman

with blonde hair holding a brown paper shopping bag that is full of items. A bottle of water and a piece of plastic protrude out of the top of the bag. The woman is smiling, apparently happy to be doing her part for Homeland Security. In the smaller image the words, “Make An Emergency Supply Kit,” anchor the image (Verizon, 2004, p. 196). Her role is linked to consumption, and is reinforced by the shopping checklist that appears immediately to the left of the “Step 1” textbox. Both the checklist and the “Step 1” instructions emphasize the need for consumption, since although some of the items might normally be found around the house, individuals should “Put together two kits. Everything needed to stay where you are and make it on your own in one. The other should be a light-weight, smaller version you can take with you if you have to get away” (Verizon, 2004, p. 196). Moreover, the practice of citizenship through consumption is related directly to the citizen/terrorist distinction. Terrorism provides an impetus for responsible citizens to consume. “Step 1” warns that:

Many potential terrorist attacks could send tiny, microscopic “junk” into the air. Many of these materials can only hurt you if they get into your body, so think about creating a barrier between yourself and contamination. It’s smart to have something for each member of the family that covers their mouths and noses. (p. 196)

In addition, “Step 1” locates the role of the mother as the primary conduit for family consumption, and even clarifies how she should evaluate the quality of certain necessary goods when making a decision about what to buy. Mindful of the needs of the family, the mother should:

Plan to use two or three layers of a cotton t-shirt, handkerchief or towel. Or consider filter masks, readily available in hardware stores, which are rated based on how small a particle they filter. It is very important that the mask or other material fit your face snugly so that

most of the air you breathe comes through the mask, not around it. Do whatever you can to make the best fit possible for your children. (p. 196)

These instructions also pose an intimate relationship between terrorism and the body, portraying the effects of an attack as an intrusion inside the body. The only barrier between citizen and terrorist is the result of consumption. Furthermore, the inside/outside divide can no longer be defined in terms of international borders, but rather collapses to the home and the body. In the event of an attack, individuals should possess “duct tape and heavyweight bags or plastic sheeting that can be used to seal windows and doors if you need to create a barrier between yourself and any potential contamination outside” (Verizon, 2004, p. 196). The primacy of home and family in the Homeland Security Guide illustrates the importance of the family apparatus in making visible and policing a population. With the emergence of biopolitics, the population replaced the family as the most important element in conceiving government, shifting the family from model of government to instrument (Foucault, 1991). Understood as an instrument in the government of a population, the family becomes a privileged means of access to society, since the family serves as the primary source of information about the population. Demographics, health, mortality, sexuality, and a host of other datum become discernible through the family. In a similar fashion, regulation of the family acts as a conduit for regulation of the population, since the welfare of the population may depend on the vaccination of children, or interventions in birth or mortality rates (p. 100). The family, in other words, serves as one of the most important governing apparatuses in the management of the social body. This primacy of the family to government is reflected in the recurrence of the house fire analogy throughout the Homeland Security Guide. On the far left of the first page, a beige color text box emphasizes the analogy. Set apart from the other written elements on the page by its large font-size, this

section reads:

The likelihood that you and your family will survive a house fire depends as much on having a working smoke detector and an exit strategy as it does on a well-trained fire department.

The same is true for surviving a terrorist attack. We must have the tools and plans in place to make it on our own... Just like having a working smoke detector, preparing for the unexpected makes sense. Get ready now. (Verizon, 2004, p. 196)

This analogy both opens and closes the Homeland Security Guide, since it not only appears on the top-left, but also on the bottom-right. In the house fire analogy, preparedness calls for families to acquire both tools and plans. As demonstrated above, the tools suggested may be accessed through consumption, but the plans refer to something else. This something else is communication, and the second step of the Homeland Security Guide articulates a model for family communication in the War on Terror. If plans imply communication, and communication is understood as a living labor, then the job of the family, and consequently of the social body, becomes the production and coordination of networks of bodies for Homeland Security.

Social Networking

In a rather concrete sense, the Homeland Security Guide, because of its physical placement in the *Superpages*, illuminates a population and emphasizes the importance of communication in the welfare of that population. Surrounded by a telephone book, the Guide occupies a position that locates the family it addresses in relation to a literal listing of the members of the local community, complete with a name, address, and phone number for each entry. The phonebook, in straightforward fashion, produces a visual, spatial link between individuals and the population. As just a listing; however, the residential pages signal only the

possible avenues of communication. The family apparatus, as organized through the Homeland Security Guide, activates these lines of communication, connecting the social body to individuals through the articulation of various relationships. The population becomes visible, through the family, as an entity dependent on the cohesion afforded by communication. “Step 2” positions the family in relation to neighborhood, office, and school; encouraging families to:

Think about the places where your family spends time: school, work and other places your family frequents. Talk to your children’s schools and your employer about emergency plans. Find out how they will communicate in an emergency. If you are an employer, be sure you have an emergency preparedness plan. Review it and practice it with your employees. A community working together during an emergency also makes sense. Talk to your neighbors about how you can work together. (Verizon, 2004, p. 197)

This section indicates the need to produce a specific type of social relationships between family, home, school, and workplace. In this organizational model, hierarchy is established through responsibility. Just as a parent must take responsibility for helping piece together the family’s security network, an employer concerned with Homeland Security takes the responsibility to set up a preparedness network in the office. The spatial dimensions of the phonebook add to this articulation. Broken down into each of their constituent elements, the phone book presents detailed data on individuals, businesses, schools, and government institutions. The Homeland Security Guide appears in the yellow pages but not in the blue or white pages. Considering that the blue pages contain government information, and that the yellow pages contain primarily information on for-profit businesses, the Guide seems out of place. This somewhat awkward location of the Guide obfuscates the distinction between the market and institutions of the state, while in a similar manner the potpourri of advertisements

that litter the white pages designated for residential listings blur the delineation between the market and the population. This situation reflects the dwindling importance of these divisions in postmodern capitalism, where the interests of the state, the population, and the market blend continuously to insure the efficiency of government.

In addition, the Homeland Security Guide articulates a relationship between citizen and state where citizens consume crucial political knowledge produced by the state. In “Step 3” a hand holding a telephone prompts the individual to “Be Informed,” explaining that:

Some of the things you can do to prepare for the unexpected, such as assembling a supply kit and developing a family communications plan, are the same for both a natural or man-made emergency. However there are important differences among potential terrorist threats, such as biological, chemical, explosive, nuclear and radiological, that will impact the decisions you make and the actions you take. Call 1-800-B-READY for a free brochure, or go to www.ready.gov to learn more about potential terrorist threats. (p. 197)

Several important items stand out in this section. First, the picture of a hand holding a telephone that introduces “Step 3” reemphasizes the importance of the phone book as a nodal point of Homeland Security. All one has to do is pick up the phone in order to learn everything about terrorist threats, find the goods needed to prepare for emergencies, and connect with other members of their communities. This arrangement connects the Homeland Security Guide to themes of survival and democracy in popular culture, where the telephone determines who gets kicked off the show or which candidates lead in the polls (Nightingale & Dwyer, 2006). In both cases, the telephone is central to the performance of democratic citizenship, and the major media corporations define the terms of competition (Nightingale & Dwyer, 2006). Second, the link to the *Ready* website provides an additional interface for Homeland Security citizenship. This link

also appears along the bottom of the first page of the Homeland Security Guide, and takes individuals to the *Ready* website where they can find detailed information on preparedness for home, business, and school. The attachment of citizenship to the internet acts another means of blurring the distinction between consumerism and citizenship, especially when considering the internet's ability to network individuals into collective political struggles (Scammel, 2000). The Homeland Security Guide cements the norms of Homeland Security into a medium that has traditionally been dominated by anti-corporate and progressive groups (Scammel, 2000), situating dissent in contradistinction to good citizenship. Third, the explication of USDHS knowledge about differing modes of terrorist attack, coupled with the blind obedience to authority in "Step 4," locates citizenship within a series of actions that culminate in the forfeiture of all individual rights. Blind obedience in the face of nuclear, chemical, or biological attack places citizenship on track with well-laid plans for the internment of U.S. citizens. Just a few weeks after 9/11, the Model State Emergency Health Powers Act gave the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) license to herd U.S. citizens suspected of exposure to hazardous materials into "camp-like holding facilities for drugging, vaccination, and quarantine, without any viable legal recourse" (Tivana, 2001, ¶ 4). Because the perpetrators of the attacks might also be among the victims, civil liberties for those quarantined would be out of the question (Mann, 2003). The final point of interest in "Step 3" is that the hand holding the telephone receiver belongs to a white body. This presence of a white body is no accident, but rather is a strategic imposition that informs all the actions of citizenship in the Homeland Security Guide.

The preceding sections attach themes of national unity, consumerism, and the production of social networks to citizenship within a strong family structure. This articulation of citizenship functions as a strategic rhetoric of whiteness, defending patriarchal familial norms in the writing

of the nation (Nakayama & Krizek, 1995). Several examples in the Homeland Security Guide evidence the work of this rhetoric. For instance, the mother as consumer discussed above positions the woman in a supportive, subordinate role in relation to the man. Further evidence of this relationship manifests in the doubled image in “Step 2” that portrays a white family looking together at a piece of paper. A father holds the “Family Communications Plan” while three daughters and a son circle around him to view it (Verizon, 2004, p. 197). The absence of the mother from this image reifies her role as a consumer and centers the family patriarch as the key organizer of social relationships, since while she is out shopping the father takes care of the organizational logistics with the kids back home. Here, the conflation of woman and motherhood produces an archetype of patriarchal citizenship. This articulation of white femininity is not benign, but rather, as Raka Shome (2001) claimed:

The domesticity of white femininity is thus highly racialized. It reveals not an absence of racial belonging but a saturation of racial coding. It is a domesticity that can come into being only by erasing the bodies of women of color from the moral imaginary of the nation. It is a domesticity that simultaneously speaks the non-domesticity of women of color. It claims a universality of its position only through its gendering of very *particular* bodies - the white female upper class heterosexual body, and that body’s imagined relation to Anglo patriarchy. (p. 328)

At work in this racial coding of citizenship is a political technology that inscribes whiteness as a location with privileged access to resources and information. White femininity in the Homeland Security Guide is shaped both by the role of woman as consumer of goods, and also by the woman as a consumer of information. The image of a hand holding a phone appearing in “Step 3” presents slim fingers, complete with a French manicure. The mother

collects information from the USDHS, but she turns this data over to the father to process. His centrality in the images in “Step 2” positions him as the key arbiter of family issues. In addition, because the Homeland Security Guide deals with an overtly nationalistic discourse “white femininity is positioned as superior to other femininities just as white masculinity is positioned as superior to other masculinities and femininities” (Prividera & Howard, 2006, p. 32). This articulation of a racial hierarchy of citizenship relies on the circulation of these images within the national fantasy (Shome, 2001), which, noting the comments in Chapter 1 on the circulation Verizon corporation, indicates that the Homeland Security Guide acts as a nodal point for writing the nation in whiteness under Homeland Security.

Conclusion

The Homeland Security Guide works a technology of citizenship grounded in patriarchal, white supremacist, upper-class norms against the distinction between these baselines and the limit point of difference from them - the figure of the terrorist. Operating as the catalyst for this articulation of patriotic citizenship, terrorism is the impetus behind all preparedness sense making. The Homeland Security Guide makes visible a population of consumers and connects this population to Homeland Security policy by programming judgments about preparedness into the context of everyday life. What occurs here is not simply a mystification of the truth about Homeland Security, but rather a particular game of truth making, or as McGee (2001) would say, the production of *phronesis*. Individuals who encounter the Homeland Security Guide enter into a rationality making logic where the inevitability of terrorist attack positions all rational judgment in intimate contact with the body. The truth behind the War on Terror is a concern elided by the imminent danger terrorism poses to the body, and citizenship becomes an exercise in taking care of one’s self and family. In other words, with the body in peril, the only concern

for citizens is biological survival, not whether or not they feel that the Homeland Security Guide is an exercise in USDHS propagandizing. Therefore, even dissenters face the alternative presented by Ridge in the opening quote. Like Joe Blom, all citizens face a choice to either lay with the proverbial stick in their sides, or get up and do something about it.

The next chapter explores how citizenship is interpreted when terrorism is removed from the logic of Homeland Security. By analyzing the elective censorship of terrorism from *Ready Kids*, Chapter 3 charts how the rhetoric of Homeland Security plays with other categories of identity/difference to make sense out of citizenship.

CHAPTER 3

READY KIDS AND THE WEATHER

Introduction

In an age when American children view around 12,000 televised acts of violence per year (FCC, 1999, ¶ 2), the entity tasked with insuring U.S. security from violence unveiled a cartoon family of mountain lion citizens that “purr, just like house cats,” instead of roaring like lions or tigers (mountain lion intro, ¶ 1). *Ready Kids* advances a sanitized view of the world for American public school students, free from violence against animals or humans. Conspicuously absent in this guide to citizenship and Homeland Security is the figure of the terrorist whose existence made possible the USDHS. *Ready Kids* is an education in security that omits the very conditions of possibility for Homeland Security even as it invokes the name. To assess the impacts of this omission for the central question of this thesis, this chapter takes on three tasks: an examination of the significance of the general form (cartoon) and context (education) of the *Ready Kids* program, an analysis of the replacement of the weather for terrorism in *Ready Kids*, and finally a detailed break down of how *Ready Kids* makes sense out of Homeland Security citizenship in the absence of terrorism.

Cartoons and Education

Ready Kids centers around a family of mountain lions developed and illustrated by renowned Disney artist Betsy Baytos (USDHS, 2006i), and openly proclaims itself as a tool for improving citizen preparedness through education. This is not the first time the federal government has turned to the Disney corporation to educate the public about citizenship during wartime. During World War II, the government recruited Walt Disney himself to design propaganda to energize the war effort at home (Szumsky, 2000). Disney’s history indicates that

the corporation knows how to make imperialism sparkle. While creating images of citizens who think local and rely on themselves, Disney simultaneously reinterprets the socio-political consequences of the corporation's control over cultural values to make them seem irrelevant to the greater cause of national unity (Szumsky, 2000). In addition, Disney manufactures audiences amenable to security by teasing out the tension between overtly despotic forms of patriotism and the images Americans learn to love as children (Shortsleeve, 2004). This tension results in paranoia as the audience attempts to reconcile the two contradictory images. Disney acknowledges openly its roles as moral educator and arbiter of cultural values, and keeps the impressionability of children in mind as it tempers its messages to accommodate families (Ward, 1996).

The position of Disney as a key source of moral education for citizens takes on acute importance when cartoons act as the mode of communication for cultural and social messages. Cartoon images are a site of political struggle over citizenship because of their ability to play with the cultural contexts of stories (Ramsey, 2000). For those cartoons designed specifically for children, this play with cultural contexts functions as a means for children to make sense of the relationships in their immediate environments. This sense-making can be guided by either open and diverse images, or by sanitized images of happy nuclear families (Gonzalez & Gonzalez, 2002). Cartoons, therefore, hold the potential to make visible the family apparatus and define citizenship in terms of a particular vision of family values. The ability of cartoons to invent new categories of citizenship by interpreting society through the family points to cartoons as a crucial battleground for the development of political sense making. Compounding this situation, the wide-scale distribution of *Ready Kids* in American public schools locates the cartoon's power to interpret images of the family within an overtly educational environment.

The educational apparatus acts as a sort of laboratory for citizen production because it is the training ground where pre-citizens learn about their responsibilities and rights before being granted the status of citizenship (Odih & Knights, 1999). Here, disciplinary technologies control bodies through establishing norms of competition to manipulate space and time. Schools operate through constant examination, which makes visible individuals “to qualify, classify, and punish” based on their performance(s) in relation to the norm established through examination (Foucault, 1977, p. 184). The *Ready Kids* program shares the telos of all examinations - to measure competence. Students who display mastery of geography, meteorology, social networking, and persuasive writing are rewarded by teachers with the “Certificate of Readiness.” Teachers are provided with detailed instructions for measuring and guiding student performance on the way to completion of the *Ready Kids* program.

Ready Kids connects the two most important apparatuses for the production of knowledge about citizenship by producing family values in the classroom. This connection is draped in the innocent play of lovable cartoon characters who’s cultural context is manipulated to articulate a particular politics of Homeland Security citizenship. To begin to flesh out the contours of this politics, the next section focuses on the replacement in *Ready Kids* of international terrorism with the weather.

The Weather Swap

Ready Kids mentions terrorism only once in the materials it makes available to U.S. students. The following brief mention appears on a webpage at the *Ready Kids* website called “Know the Facts”:

Terrorism is the use of threat or violence to scare governments into changing their policies. A terrorist can be an individual or a member of an organization. The attacks on the World Trade

Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, are examples of acts of terrorism.

The word "terrorism" first appeared in France (*terrorisme*) in 1795.

Talk to your parents or teachers if you have questions about this type of emergency.

(USDHS, 2006j, ¶19-21)

Two aspects of this pared down explanation of terrorism make the larger absence of terrorism from the *Ready Kids* program acutely conspicuous. First, the one sentence etymology of the word traces its origin to the end of the 18th century, indicating that terrorism is a danger that has been relevant to governments for hundreds of years. This move assumes that Homeland Security is simply part of a natural progression of history, since the events of 9/11 are just new examples of an old phenomenon. In short, Homeland Security is de-linked from its specific emergence in history by fitting into a larger understanding of international politics. Second, sense making associated with preparedness does not require the terrorist figure. The quoted section above sits at the bottom of a list of natural dangers including tornados, earthquakes, fire, floods, tsunamis, and hurricanes. Any of these disasters can animate the logic of preparedness, but only terrorism presents admittedly abbreviated facts. In other words, terrorism exists primarily as an adult concern, and children learn preparedness without facing the horrors of human violence. This relative absence of terrorism from *Ready Kids* provides a unique site for understanding symbolic action, since this omission does not occur in other *Ready* programs and because absence is just as important as presence in understanding human communication (McKerrow, 1989). The following two sections unpack this approach to citizen preparedness by first investigating the placement of weather as danger, and then exploring the position of the Mountain Lion family as citizens of the natural world.

Dangerous Weather

The V-Chip may offer peace of mind to parents not wanting their kids to know all the ways of the world, but some parents want their children exposed to more than others. When these interests compete in the development of public school curricula, controversy rages. Should children know how to put on a condom or not know that sex happens? Sex education is likely the 2nd most important issue for Americans after abortion, since 60% of all public school students will have sex before they reach high school graduation (Sternberg, 2002). The controversy revolves around the conflicting roles of educators and teachers when facing dangerous subject matter. Whether the implement is a condom or an emergency plan, the issue is preparedness in the face of high risk, and the question concerns the extremities of risk to which children should be exposed. Chertoff's words finesse this divide when he describes the impetus for the creative decisions in *Ready Kids*. "As we have encouraged families and school administrators to prepare for emergencies, we have often been asked if there is information appropriate to share with children. We have created *Ready Kids* in response to these requests" (USDHS, 2006c, p. 2). The response here was the relative exclusion of terrorism from *Ready Kids* and the recoding of danger in terms of the weather.

The "Know the Facts" page of *Ready Kids* poses the answer to the question of preparedness -it is mostly about the weather. These dangers of weather take on spatial dimensions with the *Ready Kids* classroom poster. This "U.S. Map Poster" encircles an aerial view of the United States with orange danger information boxes, posing a sort of risk to the U.S. from all angles. The orange boxes present facts about tornadoes, earthquakes, Nor'easters, wildfires, hurricanes, and floods (USDHS, 2006k). Weather poses a local risk, and the "Ready for Any Weather" reproducible worksheet encourages kids to use their imaginations to grasp scenarios for disaster in their own locales. Teachers are instructed to both guide students to

create stories that place the Mountain Lion family in local contexts, and also to assist in developing the persuasive writing skills of students in crafting these stories about what should be done in the event of a local natural disaster (USDHS, 2006c, p. 2).

By assigning primacy to the weather as a source of danger, *Ready Kids* accesses what Marita Sturken (2001) identifies as the American tradition of “weather volunteerism” that aligns watching the weather with civic duty and patriotic narratives. This connection of weather to citizenship articulates a citizen-consumer who possesses the middle-class flexibility to engage in leisure activities and/or has resources to prepare for disaster (p. 172). Examples of the links between weather, consumerism, and citizenship occur throughout *Ready Kids*. For instance, in the first comic strip in the student activity book, the Lion Family runs through their checklist of available goods as they prepare for an emergency. This list includes goods essential to survival such as a radio, a flashlight, and four sets of batteries, yet also contains non-essential leisure items such as favorite games, a CD player, CD’s, even more batteries, books, and magazines (USDHS, 2006b, p. 3). One could create the same list for a family vacation, especially since the entertainment items outnumber the ones related directly to survival. This bond among civic duty, preparedness, and consumerism saturates the entire *Ready* program, regardless of the form of the threat used to ground this logic. The significance of this connection manifests when disaster actually hits. Sturken (2001) contends that:

the narrative of preparedness does not simply operate at the level of privatized commercialism. It allows commercial business to speak the language of civic government and to place themselves in the protective voice with which governments speak to citizens in times of disaster (p. 179).

In other words, when citizenship and consumerism are conflated, disaster exposes the

relatively seamless interests of the market and the state under neoliberalism. This articulation of citizenship is a throwback to the one that grounded Roman-style imperialism, since now “the facility with which the rich and powerful can move around the world suggests these days that the VISA you need is as much a matter of financial capabilities” as it is an issue of politics among nation-states (Dalby, 2005, p. 436).

Wedding citizenship to consumerism produces class differences that, during an emergency, operate to justify military action against marginalized populations. If the norm for citizenship rests in the ability to consume, those populations without the means for leisure time, insurance, and mobility are rendered disposable in the event of disaster (Giroux, 2006). Weather observation itself elides this question of disposability by smoothing over the socio-economic differences that make one population more vulnerable to extreme weather than others (Sturken, 2001). Only when disaster hits do these differences crystallize. Hurricane Katrina wrought havoc on the Gulf Coast in 2005, and the federal government’s slow and ineffective response added tangibility to the class divides created by consumer-citizenship. Over 950 people died as a result of the storm and the flooding it produced (Search, 2005). News broadcasts portrayed droves of stranded Gulf Coast residents while the federal government pondered what to do. Into this gap created by a relatively non-responsive Executive in the face of a devastated population came thousands of citizen volunteers. The mainstream U.S. media picked up on these stories, glorifying the heroism of individual citizens in the face of government incompetence (Brinkley, 2006). Attaching heroism to citizenship in this fashion; however, serves to demobilize collective action by evidencing the value of individualism and local responsibility, and also by discounting the viability of political solutions (Murphy, 2003; Sturken, 2001). Giroux (2006) emphasized that Hurricane Katrina illustrates how biopolitics allows the categorization of some populations

as disposable, making the only logical government response military action to guarantee stability. Militaristic norms underwrite weather prediction in general (Sturken, 2001), but manifest in concrete form in times of emergency. When these manifestations occur, the enemy is coded as a conflation of lawlessness with poor and/or minority, thus providing a reason for turning the military against the population (Giroux, 2006).

The failure of the federal response to Katrina punctuates the magnitude of the risks associated with not being prepared for emergencies. *Ready Kids* plays on this tragedy to reinterpret the exigency for Homeland Security from the chaos of international politics to the chaos of the natural world. The way in which *Ready Kids* presents the relationship between the Mountain Lion Family and nature in general; therefore, should shed light on how Homeland Security constructs citizenship.

Mountain Lions and the Natural World

The Mountain Lion Family lives in a tree house in the forest, indicating that when nature is not wreaking havoc it provides all the resources necessary for life. All an animal has to do to survive, in other words, is to exploit these resources. Rex, the father of the Mountain Lion family, exhibits this ethic. Not only does he stay “in great shape by climbing rocks and trees, swimming across rivers, and running through the forest and plains,” but Rex also made his own guitar from a hollow tree (USDHS, 2006e, ¶ 1). Does Rex own the property on which he exercises or the tree that produced his guitar? He must since there appears to be no conflicting property interests challenging Rex, the “leader that many forest animals are happy to follow” (¶ 2). Rex seems to face no limits in his exploration of the world around him, and “loves taking his family on adventures” (¶ 1). Moreover, Rex is a cartographer who “can map out the roughest territory, the deepest river, and the tallest trees” (¶ 6). In sum, Rex can access any resource he

encounters, and uses his mapping skills to chart the location of these resources. Rex and his family seem to have carte blanche over the natural world. The fact that most people do not possess this same unfettered access to resources as the Mountain Lion family is likely a cause for confusion when kids are asked, “Do you see any similarities between the mountain lion family and your own family” (USDHS, 2006d, ¶ 3)? Puzzled students aside; however, the call for comparison reveals that the Mountain Lion family embodies preparedness norms against which students training to be citizens should be measured. Rex, in his position as a leader of *other* animals, creates a hierarchy of relations in the forest. The Mountain Lions hold status as “lords of the jungle” (¶ 1). If the Mountain Lion family sits at the top of the natural order, then their relationships to other animals should highlight the shades of difference from the norm.

The Mountain Lions appear as a gregarious family who loves helping others. This evidences the magic of cartoons, since the cultural context of *Ready*’s catamounts differs substantially from the relationship between mountain lions and nature in a non-cartoon forest. For starters, mountain lions only eat other animals. Although they purr instead of roaring, catamounts depend on violence for survival, meaning that their purr could be considered analogous to a smile to show teeth. In the *Ready Kids* activity book, the diet of the Mountain Lion family is abstracted. The only times the family discusses food occur in the activity book comic strips, when they make sure they pack a three day supply of food into their emergency kit, and also when Hector surprises them with a picnic (USDHS, 2006b). In the picnic example, the food depicted is ambiguous in nature, appearing to be pieces of bread on a plate and a jar full of some lumpy material that could be meat but is at least the very processed carcass. The identity of the food; however, is less relevant than the fact that the Mountain Lion family shares a picnic together. In their natural environment, mountain lions live solitary and secretive lives

(“Mountain Lion,” 2007), making the characterization of the Mountain Lion family as a tight knit group a radical departure from the traditional associations ascribed to these animals. Moreover, mountain lions tend to eat pets, which is a primary reason that humans are their only enemy (“Mountain Lion,” 2007). In nature, Hector Hummingbird should be a snack for Rex, not his strange pet who also acts like a son. The changes to mountain lions in the *Ready Kids* program; therefore, replace all the instincts of a solitary predator with those of a happy family.

The Mountain Lion family, in sum, embody the domestication of the rulers of the forest, and operate under the assumption that ownership is natural. The next section explores how this recoding of mountain lions as citizens of the natural world posits sense making about Homeland Security in the absence of a terrorist threat.

Sans Terrorist

The abstractions of the natural traits of mountain lions in *Ready Kids* are intentional, since the previous sections indicate that the USDHS guided these moves in a logic of age appropriateness. To better understand how these abstractions effect the sense making framework of *Ready Kids*, this section focuses first on the position of the Mountain Lion family as citizen-rulers of their world, and then on the characterization of animals in the wild as owners of property.

Citizen-Rulers

Because *Ready Kids* abstracts many of the mountain lions natural tendencies, the rare threads of continuity stand out. Like mountain lions in the non-cartoon forest, Rex “has an amazing sense of sight and touch and can find anything” (USDHS, 2006e, ¶ 5). In fact, the mountain lion’s best sense is sight (ISEC, 2007). This continuity underscores the importance of the visual in survival. Rex must be able to distinguish visual differences to locate the resources

his family needs to make it through an emergency just like mountain lions in the wild must depend on their ability to locate prey. The importance of Rex's vision; however, goes beyond the utilitarian function of staving off death. Rex is a leader, a lord of the forest who sits at the top of the pecking order, which positions him in a place of privilege in relation to all the other animals.

Mountain lions range in color from grey to dark brown, and have been characterized by "geographical races" (ISEC, 2007, ¶ 1), of which the catamount tends to be the most absent of color. Rex, identified as a catamount by the *Ready Kids* materials, and who's pale grey fur lacks almost any pigment, occupies a location of race privilege. This position, or *whiteness*, is the place "from which white people look at themselves, at others, and at society" (Gonzalez & Gonzalez, 2002, p. 416). The abstraction of whiteness is always a strategic move to rescue privilege from challenge; therefore, the only way to effectively disrupt the center is to name whiteness and attempt to dissect its operations (Nakayama and Krizek, 1995). In other words, identifying the means through which whiteness is abstracted in *Ready Kids* should indicate how whiteness nuances the sense making logic of Homeland Security.

In a somewhat obvious fashion, *Ready Kids* tempers the overt connection with whiteness displayed in other *Ready* programs. For example, in the Homeland Security Guide, photographic images present a white family doing their part for security. *Ready Kids*, by attributing human characteristics to animals, refuses white as a label for the citizens it portrays, engaging in a strategy central to the maintenance of the bond between white and privilege (Nakayama and Krizek, 1995). Despite the abstraction of color in *Ready Kids*, other aspects of privilege associated with whiteness permeate the Mountain Lion family.

Survival for the Mountain Lions depends on the strength of their family structure as a hub

of resource sharing and social networking. The clearest example of this claim occurs repeatedly in the constant reiteration of the importance of developing a “Family Communication Plan” to connect the Mountain Lions to their neighbors, places of employment, educational institutions, and government agencies. This assumption of the nuclear family as essential for survival replays a strategy employed by Disney in previous projects, and dictates a norm of unity to oppose the chaos of social upheaval (Szumsky, 2000). The norm made visible by this connection between the nuclear family and survival has several implications for citizenship. First, Rex is an articulation of heteronormativity, the strong father in a nuclear family. Li-Vollmer and LaPointe (2003) examined this operation in animated films for children, claiming that villains get coded as weak and deviant which enhances the positive gender qualities of the hero while casting same-sex desires in a negative light. This movement is reversed in the case of Rex, yet nevertheless present in Rex’s coding as heroic and strong (Nakayama & Krizek, 1995). Dennis (2003) concurred, noting that cartoons can police gender norms through what seem like benign depictions of positive qualities. In the same fashion, Purrcilla produces the role of the good mother. Her obvious visual differences with Rex indicate that Purrcilla embodies femininity and passivity. Rex’s attire makes him ready for any adventure. From his safari-ready outfit to his utility belt complete with flashlight and canteen, Rex appears prepared to face anything that comes his way. In contrast, Purrcilla’s garb serves more of an aesthetic than a functional end. Instead of a utility belt, a simple knot holds her sarong in place. Instead of accessories like a flashlight and a canteen, Purrcilla wears several pieces of jewelry. Instead of an assortment of pockets, decorations adorn her clothes. The *Ready Kids* website; however, advises that Purrcilla, perhaps despite her femininity, “will defend her family with power and strength at a moment’s notice” (USDHS, 2006f, ¶ 1). The subtle difference between Purrcilla and Rex in this instance is

that Rex is identified explicitly as a leader, while Purrcilla is more of a mentor to Rory, the daughter, and strong only when the situation demands (USDHS). *Ready Kids* even goes so far as to identify the Mountain Lions as Rex's family (USDHS, 2006b, p. 1). The gender assumptions behind Rex and Purrcilla continue to develop in the comic strips in the activity book. Rex ends the dialogue in each comic strip, locating him as the final arbiter of common sense in any given situation with his family. These examples of heteronormativity are bound intricately to whiteness, since in American society the absence of strong family bonds is often indicated as the cause for a number of social ills from poor performance in schools to gang-violence (Foster, 2003). In the words of scholar Gwendolyn Foster, "To perform whiteness well is to perform heterosexual marriage and parenthood well" (p. 123).

The abstraction of whiteness in *Ready Kids* is not limited to the role of Rex as a leader or to the structure of the Mountain Lion family. In the relationship depicted between the Mountain Lions and the natural world the concept of ownership is central.

Animals and Property

The Mountain Lion family cannot create a supply kit for emergencies without first attaining possession of the items that go into the kit. In other words, ownership predicates preparedness. The preceding sections highlight the class divisions articulated in *Ready Kids* through the concepts of leisure time and access to resources. What remains to be discussed is the relationship between the Mountain Lions and land ownership.

Before a student is eligible for certification that s/he completed the *Ready Kids* program, s/he must display an understanding of geography and cartography in relation to disaster preparedness. To this end, the teaching guide includes a separate poster depicting the United States, and instructs teachers to focus on teaching students to decipher the map's symbols. This

emphasis on mapping the natural world is more than just a lesson in understanding proximity, since maps impose political order, granting humans the privilege to conquer and control the natural environment (Nobles, 2003). In other words, charting a map functions as a political claim of ownership over a physical territory. De Certeau (1984) described the map as:

a totalizing stage on which elements of diverse origin are brought together to form the tableau of a 'state' of geographical knowledge, pushes away into its prehistory or into its posterity, as if into the wings, the operations of which it is the result or the necessary condition (p. 121).

This act of obscuring its own conditions of possibility places the map as a site of political contestation over how the world should be viewed, since the final product embodies taken for granted knowledge that tends to reinforce specific geo-political discourses (Reynolds & Fitzpatrick, 1999; Vujakovic, 2002).

The *Ready Kids* map may focus on understanding the natural environment, but its political relationship to Homeland Security is crucially important. When settlers moved into what is now known as the United States, maps articulated colonial domination, outpacing the actual rate of physical settlement (Nobles, 2003). As the United States became further colonized, depictions of [*sic*] Indian territory vanished beneath the lines demarcating U.S. territories and states. The focus of the *Ready Kids* map on geography elides the questioning of the political characteristics of the map. This move is particularly significant in the context of Homeland Security, since the map articulates a unity that does not necessarily exist. For example, the map includes U.S. territories and protectorates as part of what may be considered the homeland, but in painting these places as part of the whole ignores the contested nature of these areas. None of the people residing in these places vote on U.S. policies, yet they are subject to these policies. The question of politics gets overlooked by a focus on weather, and

alternative histories such as the one of colonization and genocide are eliminated as they are placed outside the realm of visibility. The only mention of the former occupants of what is now the United States comes in the introduction to the Mountain Lion family on the *Ready Kids* website, and even then they are relegated to a prehistory. The introduction opens with the claim that, “Long ago, Native Americans called giant cats, such as lions, tigers, and mountain lions, the lords of the forest, or catamount (which means "cat of the mountains")” (Department of Homeland Security, 2006a). Here, Native Americans are grouped into a unity, a group of people who came before and whose knowledge made possible the understanding of today’s citizen as lord of the terrain. This essentialism of Native identities not only ignores the diversity of people’s who were slaughtered in the name of American destiny, but it also subordinates Native peoples to whites since there is an explicit connection between the mountain lion and superiority. The function of cartography in *Ready Kids*; therefore, abstracts whiteness by both conflating citizenship with nationality and territory, and also by naturalizing privilege as a function of European descent (Nakayama & Krizek, 1995).

In the context of the War on Terror, these historical deployments of the “homeland” take on particular significance, since the terrorists supposedly responsible for attacks on the United States emerge outside this well-defined place. The good citizen is defined in opposition to the outsider. This normalization not only ignores what Ahmad (2004) identifies as a continuing swell of post-9/11 violence against Americans of Arab descent, Muslims, and emigrants from South Asia, but also takes on material dimensions in the institutional changes spawned by the creation of the USDHS. On March 1, 2003, the USDHS absorbed the Immigration and Naturalization Services into the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, giving the Department of Homeland Security complete oversight over U.S. immigration services (USDHS,

2003a). Historical examples point to the danger of securitizing borders, since past understandings of *homeland* as a delineated political space have been used to mark racial purity and to exclude immigrants (Kaplan, 2003). Operation Jumpstart is a concrete manifestation of this xenophobic norm, where last year President Bush deployed 6,000 military troops to the southern border of the United States (Bowers, 2007). The need that catalyzed Operation Jumpstart should itself point to the utter futility of connecting politics to definite geographical boundaries, since the health of the global market depends on the flows of goods, services, and people across borders (Dalby, 2005). Nevertheless, *Ready Kids* locates the *homeland* as the center in need of protection.

One obvious anomaly permeates the cartographic component of *Ready Kids*. In 2007, there is not unexplored land on this planet. There is no continent waiting to be mapped. If this is the case, then why is *Ready Kids* teaching children to explore and visually record the geographical dimensions of the world? What is left to be mapped? *Ready Kids* seems to provide an answer if one looks in the right place. The internet is integral to the *Ready Program* as both a means of the distribution of materials to non-urban locales and also as a vehicle for additional learning about Homeland Security. In addition, the need for access limits on the web is suggested by the exclusion of terrorism from the *Ready Kids* website. Children are taught that people in super ordinate positions control access to sensitive data. The value of this lesson in terms of security becomes clear in what O' Tuathail (2000) described as the dangers on *informationalization*. In short, the centralization of security networks is a double-edged sword, providing efficiency of use for security personnel, while at the same time making the same networks more vulnerable to asymmetrical attack (p. 174). A different answer to the question of what remains to be mapped is that what is required is a remapping of the inside/outside

relationship of the U.S. to the rest of the world. This exigency is marked by the emergence of the attachment of *homeland* to national security. Dalby (2005) explained that:

The adoption of the term *homeland security* is an interesting further indication that an imperial geography of overseas responsibilities is part of the task for US forces; clearly, they now do much more than protect national borders. While the focus is on “rebordering” the North American continent, nonetheless the implication is that the term *national security* is no longer adequate to specify the protection of the “continental” United States from attack. It apparently needs a new geographical terminology to specify security in the center of what is now implicitly understood as a larger imperial arrangement of power, military operations, and influence. It seems that *national security* has now taken on such unquestionable global connotations that the geographical distinction between the bordering of the United States and its operations abroad now apparently needs to be remapped. (pp. 422-423)

In other words, the reason behind this need for remapping is the desire to expand to the rest of the globe the values that make the *homeland* worth protecting. This logic is grounded in the assumption that danger lurks in the dark corners of the world where people have yet to realize the light of democracy and the market. The absence of terrorism in *Ready Kids*; however, seems at first glance to make this agenda behind cartography irrelevant, yet when the program is considered as a training ground for future citizens the cartographic training gives children all the sense making tools they need to engage in this type of thinking in the future. All that remains is the substitution of storms with terrorists.

Dalby (2005) concluded that political geographies are inevitable, which means the relevance of teaching these geographies is in their implications for the production of social relations. This production, outlined as a rhetorical activity in Chapter 1, articulates the

relationships between the self and the world. *Ready Kids* encourages a mapping of the social that situates Homeland Security as the bulwark against all things unexpected and chaotic. In short, mapping the *homeland* is a rhetorical undertaking that illuminates all difference in relation to the center, and also an activity that reifies the idea that territory can be owned and controlled.

Conclusion

This chapter discussed the *Ready Kids* program's replacement of terrorists with natural disasters, and the changes this substitution brings to sense making about Homeland Security. Chapter 4 will evaluate these findings, in relation to the analysis of the Homeland Security Guide in Chapter 2, in terms of the central question of this thesis, and will judge their impact on the way rhetoric is understood in postmodern capitalism.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

During his November 2005 visit to China, President Bush invited the news media to a press conference in his Beijing hotel. After answering just a few questions, Bush ended this session when he was asked by a reporter why he seemed “off his game,” unenthused, and bothered (Door, 2005, ¶ 5). Bush responded, “Have you ever heard of jet lag? Well, good. That answers your question” (¶ 6). Aggravated and apparently ready for dinner, Bush exited the lectern and broke for the door where, after shaking both handles and discovering the door would not open, he turned to the audience and let out a sheepish laugh, explaining, “I was trying to escape. Obviously, it didn’t work” (¶ 2). Bush’s anger and confusion seem understandable, given that jet lag results from “the desynchronisation between various body rhythms and environmental rhythms” (Herxheimer & Waterhouse, 2003, ¶ 2). Nevertheless, the Commander in Chief should have a better game plan for emergency exits, or even some preventative measures to guard against exhaustion. After all, the President’s meetings with the press over the past few years illustrate the speed and gravity with which the Bush lexicon can produce public relations emergencies. His team should have had better organizational plans in place when the disaster in Beijing began, so that the President would not have been trapped when he attempted to make his escape. The last thing Bush needed at that time was to feel trapped, especially when the questions he was being asked dealt with his exit strategy from an intensifying conflict in Iraq (Sanger & Kahn, 2005). One would think that the figurehead for Homeland Security would exhibit some mastery of preparedness skills, even if the stakes he faced in Beijing were not situated around his own mortality. Although Bush’s actions are humorous, an important lesson is embedded in this story. Preparedness is the business of everyday life, regardless of the threat.

The key is the omnipresence of the unexpected.

This thesis has thus far examined the configurations of Homeland Security citizenship in the USDHS *Ready* program's Homeland Security Guide and also in the *Ready Kids* campaign for public schools. Several common and divergent themes have emerged between these two Homeland Security products. This chapter evaluates these similarities and differences in terms of how they relate to the central question of this work. In other words, with the Homeland Security Guide as a baseline for understanding how the logic of Homeland Security citizenship operates when grounded in the citizen/terrorist distinction, this chapter determines how this technology of citizenship changes when terrorism is removed for the *Ready Kids* program. To this end, I first assess the commonalities between the two *Ready* products, then unpack the differences in their articulations of citizenship, and finally discuss shortcomings of this study and possibilities for future research.

Commonalities

Two similar themes manifest throughout both the Homeland Security Guide and the *Ready Kids* program. Citizenship is connected to both consumerism, and the production of social relationships.

Consumer citizenship

Although their particular articulations in this regard vary, both *Ready* products ground Homeland Security citizenship in consumerism. The Homeland Security guide posits terrorism as an imminent threat to home and body, and situates the consumption of specific goods as the means to best perform citizenship. In this case, the value of citizenship rests in the preservation of the individual's biological survival. *Ready Kids* also connects citizenship and consumerism, but this link is less overt. The Mountain Lion family must consume to prepare for natural

disaster, but the overt connection between threat and body is attenuated significantly. In fact, the appearance of leisure items in the *Ready Kids* emergency kit muddy the kit's purpose as an instrument of survival, and instead suggest that emergencies are like vacations. This move not only shields children from frightening images of mortality, but also highlights the role of leisure as a function of citizenship. A prepared family consumes entertainment products, and in an emergency turn to those products to maintain a sense of normality.

The connections between consumerism and citizenship also reveal themselves in the ways that both *Ready* outlets naturalize the concept of ownership. In *Ready Kids*, ownership of land and resources is natural to the Mountain Lion family. They live in their own tree house and have possession over a finite amount of resources. This is analogous to the family in the Homeland Security Guide who owns their home and also must consume goods to survive. In both cases, Homeland Security is constructed around the ownership of a home, or in another sense the possession of one's own territory. Not only does this naturalization of ownership as a function of citizenship produce a clear class distinction between those with the ability to own and those without, but it also situates communication along this distinction. The home and family become the nexus of all social networks, meaning that the successful production of social relationships to safeguard security requires ownership. In other words, without a home from which to branch out, Homeland Security citizenship is not possible.

Social Networks

The roles of Verizon and the Ad Council in the *Ready Program* underscore the importance of communication in postmodern capitalism. Hardt and Negri (2000) explained that: The political synthesis of social space is fixed in the space of communication. This is why communications industries have assumed such a central position. They not only organize

production on a new scale and impose a new structure adequate to global space, but also make its justification immanent. Power, as it produces, organizes; as it organizes, it speaks and expresses itself as authority. Language, as it communicates, produces commodities but moreover creates subjectivities, puts them in relation, and orders them. The communications industries integrate the imaginary and the symbolic within the biopolitical fabric, not merely putting them at the service of power but actually integrating them into its very functioning. (p. 33)

The Chapter 2 discussion of the relevance of the phonebook in the articulation of social networks illustrates this movement. A population is made visible in the residence listings, and positioned in relation to institutions of business and the state. The Homeland Security Guide connects all of these positions to civic duty, while the surrounding *Superpages* provide the material outlets for this performance of citizenship. Producing and activating links in social networks becomes, like the consumption of goods and information, the duty of all good citizens. Duty, however, operates along a hierarchy established in the family. Both *Ready* programs discussed in this work ground their versions of citizenship in the strength of the nuclear family, where patriarchal norms separate out the roles of production and consumption. In the same fashion as the father in the Homeland Security Guide, Rex Mountain Lion has the final word on decisions about how the family organizes social relationships and plans for emergencies. The mothers in both examples collect goods and information, but cede the decision making authority about how to best organize these resources to the fathers. As previously revealed, this positioning of the nuclear family is a strategic move to center whiteness in Homeland Security citizenship. The prioritization of the Mountain Lion family as lords of their forest world, if the Mountain Lions are considered an analogue of the white family in the Homeland Security Guide,

displays an overt connection of patriarchy, white supremacy, and Homeland Security.

The similar emphasis on the production of social connections in the Homeland Security Guide and *Ready Kids* demonstrates the primary importance of communication in building the infrastructure for a police state. The USDHS seal punctuates this conclusion through its strategic manipulations of the Great Seal of the United States. Just as the wings of the eagle on the USDHS seal break through the outer ring to shatter bureaucratic barriers, the production of social relationships for Homeland Security dissolves the distinction between state and society, extending relationships of control and hierarchy throughout the social body. The question still remains, however. How necessary is terrorism to the animation of Homeland Security citizenship?

Differences and Conclusions

To answer the central question of this thesis, the following section attends to how Homeland Security citizenship is articulated in the absence of terrorism. In the Homeland Security Guide, the citizen/terrorist divide is finessed through the attachment of patriotic norms. The American flag, Statue of Liberty, USDHS seal, and the eagle with three stars above its head all connect to locate citizenship in a history of sacrifice in the unified struggle for liberty. *Ready Kids*; however, lacks both a terrorist figure and symbols of American patriotism. Instead, the threats for which citizens must be prepared emerge from the chaos of the natural world, and this relationship between citizen/threat is unified through the practice of cartographic citizenship. This articulation of citizenship revolves around the prioritization of technology over nature. Specifically, this cartographic citizenship manipulates the technology/nature divide in three ways: weather watching, persuasive writing, and mapping.

Chapter 3 tied the practice of weather observation to a history of what Sturken (2001)

termed *weather volunteerism*, or the civic duty of monitoring weather threats. This duty is premised on safeguarding the interests of the market, and citizenship becomes a performance of defending the freedom to consume. Weather technologies, such as Doppler radar or methodologies of prediction, become tools for citizens to use in order to control the chaos of the natural world. This ability to control chaos locates citizenship in the order of civilization, and positions technology as the essential barrier to inevitable calamity. Impending doom is crucial to this logic, but the way that citizenship is grounded in technology indicates that the stakes in the event of a disaster center around the collapse of communication. After all, the entire *Ready Kids* program is an exercise in information networking, and bodies are arranged in hierarchical relationships to insure the smooth flow of the system. For example, the privileging of parents with access to knowledge not available to children works the hierarchies of security networks into the family. In addition, this prioritization of parents naturalizes the practice of surveillance, since it indicates that certain individuals should have only limited access to information. This is the same justification behind all security systems, and the infrastructure is built into the home with *Ready Kids*. Moreover, the replication of this security framework is an explicit goal of the *Ready Kids* program.

Ready Kids emphasizes the importance of persuasive writing to teach children the value of deliberation, but the pedagogical model in the program weds persuasion to the hierarchies of security outlined above. Students are taught to deliberate about how local emergencies should be approached, but instead of relating these events to the makeup in their actual homes, students are asked to position the Mountain Lion family as a proxy for their own family. *Ready Kids* even goes so far as to require students to compare the Mountain Lion family to their own. Here, the security network articulated through the Mountain Lions produces the norm for Homeland

Security citizenship. There is no instruction for teachers or parents in *Ready Kids* on how to deal with students who live in public housing, broken homes, or foster care. These students become outsiders looking in at Homeland Security, a position that the discussion in Chapter 3 indicates is one step from disposability. The nuclear family strategically centers whiteness, relegating otherness to the chaotic end of the technology/nature division. Only white, financially responsible, and stable families can access the technologies needed to prepare for disaster, and all other forms of everyday life become chaotic and dangerous.

This relationship takes on material dimensions in U.S. policy regarding natural disaster. Chapter 3 examined Hurricane Katrina, but another example also points to this logic taking concrete form. The 2004 tsunamis that devastated parts of South and Southeast Asia produced some interesting revelations in the press. First, the tsunamis exposed that the largest threat to human security is not terrorism, but rather is underdevelopment (Cheow, 2005). The natural world, in other words, poses such a greater threat to day-to-day existence for those without access to the benefits of technology. Second, the Bush administration saw this not as an opportunity to take a strategic advantage in the War on Terror. Instead of focusing on security against natural disaster, the administration looked at this calamity as a means to turn the tide against terrorists. Tsunamis killed numerous members and destroyed the infrastructure of opposition groups, read as terrorists by the respective states, in both Thailand and Indonesia (Shuster, 2005). The U.S. saw this as an opportunity to stamp out these terrorist threats by winning the war of ideas among the people (Shuster, 2005).

Like the persuasive writing skills in *Ready Kids* the disaster became an opportunity to defend a particular model of security citizenship. Instead of focusing on how to alleviate underlying structural inequities, this positioning of citizenship reifies the hierarchies that produce

these inequities. Those without access to stable homes become a threat to the order of civilization, collapsing the inside/outside distinction from national boundaries to the home.

Perhaps the most important function of cartographic citizenship is the mapping of territory. *Ready Kids* advances a project of mapping the physical terrain of the *homeland* in relation to threats to the population in that territory. This project, heavily controlled by the Ad Council, reveals the transformation of the corporate landscape in postmodern capitalism.

Hardt & Negri (2000) contended that:

The activities of corporations are no longer defined by the imposition of abstract command and the organization of simple theft and unequal exchange. Rather, they directly structure and articulate territories and populations. They tend to make nation-states merely instruments to record the flows of commodities, monies, and populations they set in motion. (p. 31)

In other words, mapping the *homeland* is an exercise in understanding the physical flows of capital and communication. In *Ready Kids*, the permeability of borders is illustrated by the movement of weather against the backdrop of the nation-state. Citizenship becomes a means of locating the self in relation to these flows, and communication is the means through which citizenship is positioned in these networks. As discussed in Chapter 3; however, the cartographic aspects of *Ready Kids* do not stop with maps of the nation. Rather, the new territory to be charted is the internet. Mapping the World Wide Web is not a benign practice, since the skills presented in *Ready Kids* encourage discovery, control, and the imposition of hierarchies. What results is a practice of citizenship that embodies surveillance techniques, and extends the history of American imperialism to the frontier of the internet.

Ready Kids reveals that understanding Homeland Security citizenship as a product of its difference from terrorism elides some more fundamental aspects of sense making at work.

Reading Homeland Security citizenship along the technology/nature divide exposes how the logic behind Homeland Security remains intact regardless of the threat juxtaposed with citizenship. In other words, Homeland Security citizenship is a more extreme product of the order/chaos logic endemic to realist conceptions of the globe. Communication in this logic is the fundamental means through which citizenship is charted against the inevitable chaos of the international system. These conclusions indicate that attempts to understand normalization to Homeland Security by focusing on how citizenship is positioned in relation to terrorism are bound to address only the product of another more base rhetoric. This rhetoric of order/chaos pulls norms of white supremacy, heteronormativity, class division, and technological dominance into its logic of citizenship. Whether the inevitability introduced to catalyze this articulation of citizenship is a storm or a terrorist attack, the result is the same orientation of the individual in Homeland Security.

Two items of interest for rhetorical studies emerge from this analysis. First, 9/11 may have been a watershed event in the growth of a domestic security infrastructure, but reading terrorism as the impetus of new configurations of security citizenship separates the post-9/11 period from the rest of U.S. and world history. Second, this division of history produces a limited causality between terrorism and security, ignoring how terrorism is merely attached to a logic of citizenship in place well before 9/11.

Limitations and Opportunities for Future Research

Several limitations of this study present opportunities for future research on Homeland Security. For instance, this thesis did not attend to the resistant potential of *Ready Kids* removal of terrorism from the logic that situates Homeland Security citizenship. Bruce (2001) indicated the potential of cartoons to articulate resistance, especially against the violence produced by

technological norms. In other words, animators may program subtleties into cartoons that display tactics of resistance. Betsy Baytos may be a Disney employee, but that is no guarantee of her outright loyalty to the ends sought by the corporation. This example also highlights another shortcoming of this study. By examining only *Ready* products, there is no historical investigation to chart how the technology of Homeland Security citizenship has emerged from previous articulations of American citizenship. Although this work develops an understanding of how citizens are positioned in the discourse of Homeland Security, a historical comparison could yield information on how this logic of citizenship operated before Homeland Security was introduced properly into American consciousness. In short, a historical study could yield further support to the conclusion that Homeland Security citizenship is not necessarily a product of 9/11. A further limitation of this study is the lack of attention paid to the potential of the Internet as a locus of resistance to Homeland Security. If cyberspace is the next new frontier for America's manifest destiny, then elements of resistance necessarily manifest because of the need established for security as the U.S. expands into this territory.

Conclusion

This thesis has demonstrated that there is no necessary connection between societal normalization to Homeland Security and the fear of international terrorism. Instead, Homeland Security citizenship is defined primarily by the logic of order/chaos. Terrorism is simply a means of finessing this distinction, but not altogether necessary to animate the performance of Homeland Security citizenship. Perhaps the most important finding of this thesis is the political undercurrent behind the technology of cartographic citizenship. If, as discussed in Chapter 3, mapping the *homeland* is a political activity that obfuscates its own conditions of possibility, then *Ready Kids* illustrates the play of Homeland Security in situating itself in society by

divorcing itself from international terrorism. What this signals for the future is that Homeland Security citizenship can develop absent the figure of the terrorist. In fact, Homeland Security citizenship is itself a practice in divorcing terrorism from the logic that cements new networks of security into the social body.

Notes

¹ Neoliberalism describes a change in the state form from alignment with Keynesian policies of social welfare to a post-Fordist configuration characterized by the fostering of competitiveness, hostility to subsidized welfare, increasing dependency on information technology and services, and a rearrangement of production toward specialized markets (Passavant, 2005).

² Not everyone agrees with the turn to understand the audience as inter-subjective. In response to McKerrow's project of critical rhetoric, Dana Cloud (1994) stakes out an argument that counters discourse-centered theories of rhetoric. For Cloud (1994), "The attempt to redefine discourse as a constitutive element of material relations- in other words, to argue for the materiality of discourse, is part and parcel of the poststructuralist shift toward discourse theory," that is, "to varying degrees anti-realist (relativist) and anti-materialist (idealist)" (p. 142). On the one hand, Cloud contends that the work of ideology critics in Rhetorical Studies, especially those pieces of scholarship surrounding the contributions of Michael McGee, prioritizes ideals or ideas of how a community or nation is created over, "its motivations or consequences for people living and dying with the war" (p. 149). Cloud makes three arguments in this regard: that collapsing text and context rules out the study of material conditions since it limits the critic to descriptions of intertextual relations among cultural texts, that the fragmentation thesis overestimates the ability of the audience to make sense of the increasingly complex array of differing fragments of public culture, and finally that no transformation of the norms of public culture is possible unless they culminate in, "some concrete oppositional action" (p. 151). McKerrow and followers of critical rhetoric, on the other hand, suffer from the relativism associated with the denial of absolute truth or reality. In this respect, Cloud argues that relativism negates the ability of the rhetorical critic to, "adjudicate the truth or falsity of a

discourse, or to speculate about whose interests are served by a particular set of texts” (p. 153).

In opposition to the idealist and relativist tendencies of discourse theories of rhetoric, Cloud outlines a modernist plan for ideology critique, which she argues is, “the only critical stance that suggests discourse may justify oppression and exploitation, but texts do not themselves constitute the oppression” (p. 157). Under Cloud’s guidance, rhetorical criticism is tasked both with unmasking the material conditions of domination in order to understand the ways in which an elite class deceives the masses (audience) to justify the actual conditions of oppression, and also proposing models by which large groups of individuals can reach critical mass as oppositional movements against status quo social relations of domination.

References

- Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life* (D. Heller-Roazen, Trans.). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Agamben, G. (2002). Security and terror. *Theory and Event*, 5. (C. Emcke, Trans.). Retrieved April 19, 2006, from Project Muse database.
- Althusser, L. (2001). *Lenin and Philosophy and other essays* (B. Brewster, Trans.). New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Aretxaga, B. (2002). Terror as thrill: First thoughts on the 'War on Terrorism.' *Anthropological Quarterly*, 75, 139-150.
- Asen, R. (2004). A discourse theory of citizenship. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 90, 189-211.
- Athanasiou, A. (2003). Technologies of humanness, aporias of biopolitics, and the cut body of humanity. *differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, 14, 125-162.
- Barr, B. (2003, September). Patriot Act games; it can happen here. *The American Spectator*. Retrieved March 29, 2006, from Lexis-Nexis database.
- Bay, N. (2005). Executive power and the War on Terror. *Denver University Law Review*, 83. Retrieved April 10, 2006, from Lexis-Nexis database.
- Berrettini, M. (2002). Can 'we all' get along? Social difference, the future, and Strange Days. *Camera Obscura*, 17, 155-189.
- Biesecker, B. (1989). Rethinking the rhetorical situation from within the thematic of *difference*. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 22, 110-130.
- Bird, R., & Brandt, E. (2002). Academic freedom and 9/11: How the war on terrorism threatens free speech on campus. *Communication Law & Policy*, 7, 431-459.

- Bowers, F. (2007, February 15). Illegal crossings drop on US-Mexico border. *Christian Science Monitor*. Retrieved February 15, 2007, from <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/02/15/national/main2482301.shtml>
- Brinkley, D. (2006). *The great deluge: Hurricane Katrina, New Orleans, and the Mississippi gulf coast*. New York: William Morrow.
- Bruce, D. (2001). Notes toward a rhetoric of animation: *The Road Runner* as cultural critique. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 18, 229-245.
- Bush backs Pentagon on barring coffin photos. (2004, April 23). *MSNBC*. Retrieved March 6, 2006, from <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/4807865/>
- Butler, J. (2002). Explanation and exoneration, or what we can hear. *Social Text*, 72, 177-188.
- Campbell, H. (2003). Beyond militarism and terrorism in the biotech century: Toward a culture of peace and transformation. *Radical History Review*, 85, 24-36.
- Cheow, E. (2005, January 25). After the tsunami, human security is key. *Asia Times On-Line*. Retrieved February 13, 2007, from http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Southeast_Asia/GA25Ae04.html Retrieved
- Clark, M. (2004). Rhetoric, patriarchy & war: Explaining the dangers of “leadership” in mass culture. *Women & Language*, 27, 21-29.
- Clifford, M. (2001). *Political genealogy after Foucault: Savage identities*. New York: Rutledge.
- Cloud, D. (2004). The materiality of discourse as oxymoron: A challenge to critical rhetoric. *Western Journal of Communication*, 58, 141-163.
- Copeland, R. (2004). War on terrorism or war on constitutional rights? Blurring the lines of intelligence gathering in post-September 11 America. *Texas Tech Law Review*, 35, 1-31.
- Dalby, S. (2005). Political space: Autonomy, liberalism, and empire. *Alternatives*, 30, 415-441.

- de Certeau (1984). *The practice of everyday life* (S. Rendall, Trans.). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- De Beaugrande, R. (2004). Critical discourse analysis from the perspective of ecologism. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 1, 113-146.
- Deflem, M. (2004). Social control and the policing of terrorism: Foundations for a sociology of counter-terrorism. *The American Sociologist*, 35, 75-92.
- Dennis, J. (2003). Signifying same-sex desire in television cartoons. *Journal of Popular Film & Television*, 31, 133-140.
- Der Derian, J. (2002). The war of networks. *Theory and Event*, 5. Retrieved May 1, 2006, from Project Muse database.
- Dickinson, G. (2005). Selling democracy: Consumer culture and citizenship in the wake of September 11. *Southern Communication Journal*, 70, 271-284.
- Door thwarts quick exit for Bush. (2005, November 20). *BBC News*. Retrieved February 13, 2007, from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/asia-pacific/4454738.stm>
- Drew, J. (2004). Identity crisis: Gender, public discourse, and 9/11. *Women & Language*, 27, 71-78.
- Eland, I. (2003). Bush's wars and the state of civil liberties. *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 14, 158-175.
- FCC - Federal Communications Commission. (1999, July 1). *Fact Sheet: V-Chip*. Retrieved February 10, 2007, from http://www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Mass_Media/Factsheets/factvchip.html
- Foster, G. (2003). *Performing whiteness: Postmodern re/constructions in the cinema*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. (A. Sheridan, Trans.). London: Allen Lane.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews & other writings*. (C. Gordon, Ed.; C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mephu, K. Soper, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. In H. L. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1988a). Technologies of the self. In L. H. Martin, H. Gutman, & P. H. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault* (pp. 16-49). Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press.
- Foucault, M. (1988b). The political technology of individuals. In L. H. Martin, H. Gutman, & P. H. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault* (pp. 145-162). Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, and P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Giroux, H. (2004). Pedagogy, film, and the responsibility of intellectuals: A response. *Cinema Journal*, 43, 119-126.
- Giroux, H. (2005). The terror of neoliberalism: Rethinking the significance of cultural politics. *College Literature*, 32, 1-19.
- Giroux, H. (2006). Reading Hurricane Katrina: Race, class, and the biopolitics of disposability. *College Literature*, 33, 171-196.
- Gonzalez, A., & Gonzalez, J. (2002). The color problem in Sillyville: Negotiating white identity in one popular "kid-vid." *Communication Quarterly*, 50, 410-421.

- Greene, R. (1998). Another materialist rhetoric. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 15, 21-41.
- Greene, R. (2004). Rhetoric and capitalism: Rhetorical agency as communicative labor. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 37, 188-206.
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (1994). *Labor of Dionysus: A critique of State-Form*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hariman, R., & Lucaites, J. (2002). Performing civic identity: The iconic photograph of the flag raising on Iwo Jima. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 88, 363-392.
- Hentoff, N. (2003, September 29). War on the Bill of Rights. *In These Times*, p. 23.
- Heraldry. (2006, May 30). *Wikipedia: The free encyclopedia*. Retrieved May 30, 2006, from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Heraldry>
- Herxheimer, A., & Waterhouse, J. (2003). The prevention and treatment of jet lag. *British Medical Journal*, 326, 296-297. Retrieved February 13, 2007, from <http://www.bmj.com/cgi/content/full/326/7384/296>
- Hutcheson, J., Domke, D., Billeaudeau, A., & Garland, P. (2004). U.S. national identity, political elites, and a patriotic press following September 11. *Political Communication*, 21, 27-50.
- ISEC - International Society for Endangered Cats. (2007). *Cougar*. Retrieved February 12, 2007, from <http://www.wildcatconservation.org/cats/factsheets/northamerica/cougar/index.shtml>
- Isin, E. (2004). The neurotic citizen. *Citizenship Studies*, 8, 217-235.
- Jameson, F. (2002). The dialectics of disaster. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 101, 297-304.

- Janz, W. (1995, March 15). Freak accident shows family how lucky it is. *Milwaukee Sentinel*.
Retrieved October 11, 2006, from
http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qn4208/is_19950315/ai_n10188985
- Kaplan, A. (2003). Homeland insecurities: Reflections of language and space. *Radical History Review*, 85, 82-93.
- Larson, S. (2006, May 21). A heckuva job. *The San Diego Union-Tribune*. Retrieved, February 10, 2007 from http://www.signonsandiego.com/uniontrib/20060521/news_lz1v21deluge.html
- Lichtblau, E. (2006, July 14). Bush would let secret court sift wiretap process. *New York Times*, p. A1.
- Maira, S. (2004). Youth culture, citizenship and globalization: South Asian Muslim youth in the United States after September 11th. *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa, and the Middle East*, 24, 219-231.
- Mann, S. (2003). Decon_≤ (decon squared): Deconstructing decontamination. *Leonardo*, 36, 285-290.
- Marvin, C. (2005). *War as a Failed Ritual Sacrifice from Vietnam to Iraq*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Sheraton New York, New York City, NY. Retrieved October 11, 2006, from
http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p14263_index.html
- Mbembe, A. (2003). Necropolitics. *Public Culture*, 15, 11-40.
- McCulloch, J. (2002). 'Either you are with us or you are with the terrorists': The war's home front. In P. Scranton (Ed.), *Beyond September 11: An anthology of dissent* (pp. 54-59). London: Pluto Press.

- McGee, M. (2001). Text, context, and the fragmentation of contemporary culture. *(f)ragments*. Retrieved May 15, 2006, from <http://www.mcgees.net/fragments/essays/archives/text.htm>
- McKerrow, R. (1989). Critical rhetoric: Theory and praxis. *Communication Monographs*, 56, 91-112.
- McMellon, C., & Long, M. (2006). Sympathy, patriotism and cynicism: Post-9/11 New York City newspaper advertising content and consumer reactions. *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 28, 1-18.
- Milbank, J. (2002). Sovereignty, empire, capital, and terror. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 101, 305-323.
- Miller, T. (1998). *Technologies of truth: Cultural citizenship and the popular media*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mountain Lion. (2007, January 29). *The Animal Files*. Retrieved February 12, 2007, from http://www.theanimalfiles.com/mammals/carnivores/mountain_lion.html
- Murphy, T. (2003). Romantic democracy and the rhetoric of heroic citizenship. *Communication Quarterly*, 51, 192-208.
- Nakayama, T., & Krizek, R. (1995). Whiteness: A strategic rhetoric. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 81, 291-309.
- Niccolai, J., & Gross, G. (2005, February 14). Update: Verizon sweeps up MCI in \$6.7B merger. *Computerworld*. Retrieved March 3, 2005, from <http://computerworld.com/management/topics/outsourcing/isptelecom/story/0,10801,99746,00.html>
- Nightingale, V., & Dwyer, T. (2006). The audience politics of 'enhanced' television formats. *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics*, 2, 25-42.
- Noorani, Y. (2005). The rhetoric of security. *CR: The New Centennial Review*, 5, 13-41.

- O Tuathail, G. (2000). The postmodern geopolitical condition: States, statecraft, and security at the millennium. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 90, 166-178.
- Odih, P., & Knights, D. (1999). "Discipline needs time": Education for citizenship and the financially self disciplined subject. *The School Field*, 10, 127-152.
- Overington, C. (2004, April 23). Sacked for photo Americans weren't meant to see. *Sydney Morning Herald*. Retrieved March 6, 2006, from <http://www.smh.com.au/articles/2004/04/22/1082616268111.html>
- Parenti, M. (2002). *The terrorism trap: September 11 and beyond*. San Francisco: City Light Books.
- Passavant, P. (2005). The strong neo-liberal state: Crime, consumption, governance. *Theory & Event*, 8. Retrieved March 6, 2006, from Project Muse database.
- Patriot Act 'compromise' trades liberty for safety. (2006, March 2). *USA Today*, p. 10A.
- Pease, D. (2003). The global homeland state: Bush's biopolitical settlement. *boundary 2*(30), 1-18.
- Potter, D. (2002). Flagging the problem. *American Journalism Review*, 24, 64.
- Prividera, L., & Howard, J. (2006). Masculinity, whiteness, and the warrior hero: Perpetuating the strategic rhetoric of U.S. nationalism and the marginalization of women. *Women and Language*, 29, 29-37.
- Procter, D. (1990). The dynamic spectacle: Transforming experience into social forms of community. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 76, 117-133.
- Puar, J., & Rai, A. (2002). Monster, terrorist, fag: The war on terrorism and the production of docile patriots. *Social Text*, 20, 117-148.

- Puar, J., & Rai, A. (2004). The remaking of a model minority: Perverse projectiles under the specter of (counter)terrorism. *Social Text*, 22, 75-104.
- Rajiva, L. (2006). Prometheus: The emergence of the police state in America. *CR: The New Centennial Review*, 6, 133-169.
- Ramsey, E. (2000). Inventing citizens during World War I: Suffrage cartoons in *The Woman Citizen*. *Western Journal of Communication*, 64, 113-147.
- Reynolds, B, & Fitzpatrick, J. (1999). The transversality of Michel de Certeau: Foucault's panoptic discourse and the cartographic impulse. *Diacritics*, 29, 63-80.
- Roland, A. (2006, August 20). Rex 84: FEMA's blueprint for martial law in America. *Global Research*. Retrieved January 12, 2007, from <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=viewArticle&code=ROL20060820&articleId=3010>
- Salaita, S. (2005). Ethnic identity and imperative patriotism: Arab Americans before and after 9/11. *College Literature*, 32, 146-168.
- Sanger, D., & Kahn, J. (2005, November 21). Chinese leader gives Bush a mixed message. *The New York Times*. Retrieved February 13, 2007, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/11/21/international/asia/21prexy.html?pagewanted=1&ei=5088&en=2a29f16bddbb27a3&ex=1290229200&partner=rssnyt&emc=rss>
- Scammel, M. (2000). The internet and civic engagement: The age of the citizen-consumer. *Political Communication*, 17, 351-355.
- Search for Katrina bodies is over. (2005, October 4). *BBC News*. Retrieved July 20, 2006, from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/americas/4308074.stm>

- Shome, R. (2001). White femininity and the discourse of the nation: Re/membering Princess Diana. *Feminist Media Studies*, 1, 323-342.
- Shortsleeve, K. (2004). The wonderful world of the Depression: Disney, despotism, and the 1930's. Or, why Disney scares us. *The Lion and the Unicorn*, 28, 1-30.
- Shuster, H. (2005, January 4). Experts: Tsunami disaster might ease terrorism. *CNN*. Retrieved February 13, 2007, from <http://edition.cnn.com/2005/WORLD/asiapcf/01/04/terrorism/index.html>
- Spratt, M., Peterson, A., & Lagos, T. (2005). Of photographs and flags: Uses and perceptions of an iconic image before and after September 11, 2001. *Popular Communication*, 3, 117-136.
- Spigel, L. (2004). Entertainment wars: Television culture after 9/11. *American Quarterly*, 56, 235-270.
- Steinmetz, G. (2003). The state of emergency and the revival of American imperialism: Toward an authoritarian post-Fordism. *Public Culture*, 15, 323-345.
- Sternberg, S. (2002). Sex education stirs controversy. *USA Today*. Retrieved February 10, 2007, from <http://www.usatoday.com/news/health/child/2002-07-11-sex-ed-controversy.htm>
- Stormer, N. (2004). Articulation: A working paper on rhetoric and taxis. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 90, 257-284.
- Sturken, M. (2001). Desiring the weather: El Nino, the media, and California identity. *Public Culture*, 13, 161-189.
- SuperPagesFacts.com (2004, October 7). Court rules in favor of Verizon vs. Yellow Book. Retrieved April 12, 2005, from <http://www.superpagesfacts.com/>
- Szumsky, B. (2000). "All that is solid melts into the air": The winds of change and other Disney analogues of colonialism in Disney's *Mary Poppins*. *The Lion and the Unicorn*, 24, 97-109.

- Tivana, M. (2001, November 12). Small pox - Waging ultimate bio-warfare. *The Tribal Messenger*. Retrieved January 12, 2007, from http://wearcam.org/decon/detainment_camps11-13-smallpox.htm
- Turner, J. (1998). Collapsing the interior/exterior distinction: Surveillance, spectacle, and suspense in popular cinema. *Wide Angle*, 20, 92-123.
- USDHS - United States Department of Homeland Security. (2003a, March 2). *Department of Homeland Security facts for March 1, 2003*. Retrieved March 6, 2006, from http://www.dhs.gov/xnews/releases/press_release_0100.shtm
- USDHS - United States Department of Homeland Security. (2003b, June 19). *Fact sheet: Department of Homeland Security Seal*. Retrieved May 30, 2006, from <http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/display?content=1035>
- USDHS - United States Department of Homeland Security. (2006a, February 2). *Fact sheet: Ready Kids*. Retrieved March 6, 2006, from <http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/display?content=5382>
- USDHS - United States Department of Homeland Security. (2006b). *Ready kids activity book*. Retrieved March 6, 2006, from http://www.ready.gov/kids/_downloads/inschool_book.pdf
- USDHS - United States Department of Homeland Security. (2006c). *Lessons and activities in language arts and geography*. Retrieved March 6, 2006, from http://www.ready.gov/kids/_downloads/inschool_plan.pdf
- USDHS - United States Department of Homeland Security. (2006d). *Learn about the mountain lion family: Did you know?* Retrieved March 6, 2006, from <http://www.ready.gov/kids/family/index.html>

USDHS - United States Department of Homeland Security. (2006e). *Learn about the mountain lion family: Rex, the dad*. Retrieved March 6, 2006, from <http://www.ready.gov/kids/family/dad.html>

USDHS - United States Department of Homeland Security. (2006f). *Learn about the mountain lion family: Purrcilla, the mom*. Retrieved March 6, 2006, from <http://www.ready.gov/kids/family/mom.html>

USDHS - United States Department of Homeland Security. (2006g). *Learn about the mountain lion family: Rory, the daughter*. Retrieved March 6, 2006, from <http://www.ready.gov/kids/family/daughter.html>

USDHS - United States Department of Homeland Security. (2006h). *Learn about the mountain lion family: Hector hummingbird*. Retrieved March 6, 2006, from <http://www.ready.gov/kids/family/hummingbird.html>

USDHS - United States Department of Homeland Security. (2006i). *Learn about the mountain lion family: Betsy Baytos, the artist*. Retrieved March 6, 2006, from <http://www.ready.gov/kids/family/betsy.html>

USDHS - United States Department of Homeland Security. (2006j). *Know the facts*. Retrieved March 6, 2006, from <http://www.ready.gov/kids/step3/index.html>

USDHS - United States Department of Homeland Security. (2006k). *U.S. map poster*. Retrieved March 6, 2006, from http://www.ready.gov/kids/_downloads/inschool_poster.pdf

USDS - United States Department of State. (2003, July). *The great seal of the United States*. Retrieved May 30, 2006, from http://www.state.gov/www/publications/great_seal.pdf

USNC - United States Northern Command. (2006, March 4). *U.S. Northern Command: Crest and heraldry*. Retrieved May 30, 2006, from

http://www.northcom.mil/about_us/heraldry.htm

Velde, F. (2003, December 8). *Official heraldry of the United States*. Retrieved May 30, 2006, from <http://www.heraldica.org/topics/usa/usheroff.htm>

Verizon. (2004). Homeland security guide. *Denton Superpages*, 196-197.

Vujakovic, P. (2002). Mapping the war zone: Cartography, geopolitics and security discourse in the UK press. *Journalism Studies*, 3, 187-202.

Walters, W. (2004). Secure borders, safe haven, domopolitics. *Citizenship Studies*, 8, 237-260.

Ward, A. (1996). The Lion King's mythic narrative. *Journal of Popular Film & Television*, 23, 171-179.

Young, D. (2005). Sacrifice, consumption, and the American way of life: Advertising and domestic propaganda during WW II. *The Communication Review*, 8, 27-52.

Zubek, P. (2006, February 3). Ready Kids - education or politics? *The Gazette*. Retrieved March 6, 2006, from <http://www.gazette.com/display.php?id=1314300&secid=1>